EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/empireclubofcana1934unse

Courtesy of Who's Who in Canada.

DANA H. PORTER, ESQ.,

PRESIDENT OF THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA, 1934-35

EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

ADDRESSES DELIVERED TO THE MEMBERS DURING THE YEAR 1934-1935

Thirty-second Year of Issue

CANADA AND A UNITED EMPIRE

GOD SAVE THE KING

TORONTO:
PRINTERS GUILD, LIMITED

Copyright, Canada, 1935
The Empire Club of Canada

PRINTED IN CANADA

PRINTERS GUILD, LIMITED

TORONTO, ONT.

CONTENTS

PAGE

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE vii

ADDRESSES:

THE LESSONS OF NAVAL HISTORY 1
ADMIRAL SIR ROGER KEYES, BT.

GREETINGS FROM MON. FLANDIN OF FRANCE 15

A BRITON LOOKS AT THE WORLD 17
REVEREND FREDERICK W. NORWOOD, D.D.

EMPIRE TRADE 30
VISCOUNT ELIBANK.

A WHOLE WORLD AGAINST US 44
PROFESSOR WILLSON WOODSIDE.

LEADERSHIP 57
THE MOST REVEREND DERWYN T. OWEN, PRIMATE OF ALL CANADA.

THE POLITICAL FUTURE IN ENGLAND 67
THE MARQUESS OF LOTHIAN, C.H.

A PERSONAL CONFESSION OF FAITH 81
MISS VERA BRITTAIN.

PRESENT POSITION OF THE U.S.S.R. 99
MR. ALLAN MONKHOUSE.

MUNITIONS 118
U. S. SENATOR NYE.

FOUR NATIONS 137
COLONEL CHARLES MORROW.

EXPLORERS AND THE BRITISH EMPIRE 148
BRIGADIER GENERAL SIR PERCY SYKES.

THE GOAT AND THE VINE 161
SIR ANDREW MACPHAIL.

GOOD MUSIC MADE POPULAR 173
MR. REGINALD STEWART.

EXCITING EVENTS 183
HIS WORSHIP, MAYOR JAMES SIMPSON.

PAGE

MAKING A MINE IN CANADA 197
MR. JOHN E. HAMMELL.

WHAT IS THE CAUSE OF WAR? 216
MR. JOHN STRACHEY.

INDIA AND THE EMPIRE 229
MR. A. I. RAJA-SINGHAM.

THE MELANCHOLY OF LAUGHTER 246
MR. H. NAPIER MOORE.

THE THEATRE 260
DAME SYBIL THORNDIKE, C.B.E.

MANUFACTURING AS A PROFESSION 275
MR. ARTHUR B. PURVIS.

CONDITIONS IN THE WEST 296
HON. JAMES GARFIELD GARDINER.

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE N.R.A. 316
MR. WILLIAM O. SCROGGS.

THE NEWSPRINT RIDDLE 329
MR. CHARLES A. M. VINING, A.M.B.A.

MUNITIONS AND COMMON SENSE 342
MAJOR L. A. CODD.

GILBERT AND SULLIVAN OPERAS 355
THE D'OYLY CARTE OPERA COMPANY.

AN ADDRESS BY MR. WALTER HUSTON 361

ECONOMIC RECOVERY IN GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES 374
H. CARL GOLDENBERG, M.A., B.C.L.

ANNUAL MEETING 390

ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT 393

HONOURARY AND PAST PRESIDENTS 394

CONSTITUTION 395
INSTITUTED 1903.

HONOURARY AND LIFE MEMBERS 400
RESIDENT MEMBERS.
NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE

YEAR 1934-35

Patron:

FIELD MARSHAL H.R.H., THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT
AND STRATHEARN, K.G., G.C.M.G.

President: DANA H. PORTER, ESQ.
First Vice-President: MAIN JOHNSON, ESQ.
Third Vice-President: MAJOR GORDON B. BALFOUR, K.C.
Second Vice-President: COL. G. G. BLACKSTOCK.
Honorary Secretary: H. F. POWELL, ESQ.
Honorary Treasurer: COL. B. O. HOOPER.

Executive Committee:

JAS. S. P. ARMSTRONG, ESQ.
J. H. BRACE, ESQ.
H. D. BURNS, ESQ.
R. H. CARDY, ESQ.
GEO. D. DAVIS, ESQ.
F. B. FETHERSTONHAUGH, ESQ., K.C.
GEO. C. GALE, ESQ.
R. M. HARCOURT, ESQ.
W. M. HARGRAFT, ESQ.
F. BEVERLEY MATTHEWS, ESQ.
J. P. PRATT, ESQ., K.C.
B. K. SANDWELL, ESQ.
J. D. SPENCE, ESQ., K.C.
E. J. THOMPSON, ESQ.
PRINCIPAL MALCOLM W. WALLACE
HOWARD WEBSTER, ESQ.

Immediate Past President: MAJOR W. JAMES BAXTER

Past Presidents:

COL. A. E. KIRKPATRICK
WM. BROOKS, ESQ.
REV. DR. R. N. BURNS

THE LESSONS OF NAVAL HISTORY

AN ADDRESS BY ADMIRAL OF THE FLEET, SIR ROGER KEYES, BT.

September 4, 1934

MR. DANA PORTER, President of The Empire Club, introduced the Guest Speaker, SIR ROGER KEYES, Bt.

PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, it is a rare privilege for an inland city, such as Toronto, to be in a position to introduce an Admiral of the Fleet.

Sir Roger Keyes is in this country as an official representative of the British Government at the Jacques Cartier celebrations which have recently been held in Quebec. He is also here to represent the British Government at the celebrations which are being held in Old Fort Niagara, in New York State.

Those celebrations are now in progress and the Committee in charge of the arrangements of those celebrations have asked me to urge as many members of this Club as possible to avail themselves of the opportunity to go either tonight or tomorrow night, to Old Fort Niagara to see the pageant which will be presented there.

Sir Roger Keyes has had a long and distinguished naval career. His name has been associated with submarine warfare, with the Mediterranean fleet at different times and at one time duing the War he was Director of Plans of the Admiralty. His wartime service culminated in the year 1918, in the famous operations which were conducted against Zeebrugge and Ostend. Sir Roger Keyes was in charge of those operations.

Sir Roger Keyes, having the rank of Admiral of the Fleet, which in the Navy is equal to Field-Marshal in the army, is of the only rank of the Navy which is permitted under the laws of Great Britain to run for Parliament. This spring, Sir Roger Keyes allowed himself to accept a nomination in a by-election in Great Britain and now represents a constituency as a Member of the House of Commons. (Applause.)

Sir Roger Keyes represents that happy blend of one who has a very high technical knowledge and experience and those political gifts and accomplishments which enable him to convey his message to the minds and the hearts of the public at large. Sir Rogers Keyes.

SIR ROGER KEYES: Mr. President and Gentlemen: You have done me a great honour in inviting me to address this gathering of the Empire Club of Canada. As I can assure you, I am very proud to be here. I was asked what subject I would choose. Well, naturally, having spent all my life in the navy, and knowing something about the value of sea power—I think I do—I chose this subject, "The Lessons of Naval History".

Before commencing, I would like to tell you what I have been doing for the last ten days. First of all, the City of Toronto did me the great honour of inviting me to attend that wonderful gathering of ex-service men which you had here recently and which Lord Allenby and my great friend, Reginald Tyrwhitt, one of the other Admirals of the Fleet attended. It was a very great disappointment to me not to come because I have so many Canadian friends who I not only met in the War and who served in the same Fleet, but a great many served actually under my command. I had two hundred air craft in my command and they also served in the motor launches in those actions on the Belgian Coast. I think that there were nine or ten Victoria Crosses won on the Belgian Coast and none was won more gallantly than that by Lieutenant Bourke, a Canadian. To look at him, you might think he was a little fellow who wore spectacles. But when the Vindictive was trapped during the attempt to blockade the submarine base at Ostend, there was very little hope of getting anybody away and two motor launches volunteered to go in. Bourke went; he got a most awful hammering, but he was successful in saving some of the crew of the Vindictive for which he got the Victoria Cross.

It was a great disappointment for me not to be here with Lord Allenby and Sir Reginald Tyrwhitt, but Mr. Thomas met me in the House of Commons one day and he begged me to represent the British Government at these celebrations to do honour to the memory of a very gallant French seaman, Jacques Cartier. As I knew that our travels would bring us to Toronto, I thought that Reginald Tyrwhitt would keep the navy's end up here and I would come later on and have another opportunity of seeing the people of Toronto, who so kindly invited me before. I cannot tell you how glad I am to have done the other thing, too, because there at Gaspe, in company with Mr. Flandin, who has honoured us here by attending this meeting, we stood under the cross, at the place where Jacques Cartier raised the Cross of our religion at Gaspe and who really was the founder of this great Dominion. Then we travelled up his route to Quebec, to Three Rivers and to Montreal. We heard Mr. Flandin speak. He made a speech which lasted about twenty minutes in absolutely perfect English. I think if you have any Quebec friends here, they will tell you they never heard a foreigner speak as he did last night.

As a sailor—of course, who didn't sail on many seas—one was full of admiration for the gallant spirit of Jacques Cartier, coming across the stormy ocean in a tiny ship and navigating the St. Lawrence and withstanding the hard and fierce winters—and without the comforts that you have nowadays—in that little stream at Quebec.

And here we are at the end of our tour and I must say I didn't expect to see Mr. Flandin here. I am very glad that he has escaped to come here—he will have to listen to me again.

I was asked to name a subject and I propose to talk to you on the importance of sea power in relation to the British Empire.

When a plea for the reduction of armaments is urged in the interests of peace or economy, or in a genuine, though I submit a misguided belief that general disarmament will eliminate all risk of war in the future, can one be surprised if nations to whom sea power is in no way vital, and who can ensure security by other means, should wish to commence disarmament by reducing Great Britain's navy to an extent out of all proportion to her world wide needs; particularly, in these days, when there is of necessity, an ever increasing rivalry in the field of sea-borne commerce.

You had recently in this city, that distinguished Field Marshal, Lord Allenby, who commanded an army which he led to the goal of every previous crusade and captured Jerusalem in the last and greatest of all crusades. I am sure that great soldier would be glad to testify that his brilliant campaign could not have been conducted to its successful issue from a base 3,000 miles from England, but for the fact that the Sea Services commanded his sea communications and the waters on the left flank of his army.

So it has been down the ages of our Empire building, an adventurous sea reconnaissance, the transport overseas of an army of stout hearted colonists and the safeguarding of their sea communications by Maritime power.

Our great Empire, founded by the gallant enterprise of our forebears and the sea spirit which runs in the blood of our race can surely only be maintained in the future as it has in the past, by policing of its outposts by soldiers, sailors, airmen or police, according to the circumstances, and the keeping of its communications safe and free from interference in peace and war by our great sea services.

I say Service, because the war welded into one great Sea Service all British seamen who go down to the sea in ships, and also all sorts of other men of all sorts of walks in life who joined the Volunteer Service—here in Canada, in Australia, in England and in Scotland—men who had nothing to do with the sea went down and served and it was a very hard life sometimes in the motor launches which were of such great value to us in the War, and also the British seamen, the Mercantile Marine, the fishing craft, the tramp steamers, the ocean liners—vessels great and small all contributed to British maritime sea power.

Now, I will try to tell you something about the English seamen who did great service in the past in making England the Empire it is today and in making all these great Dominions a part of the great Commonwealth of British Nations which is united by the throne of King George. It would take long to tell and I would weary you if I tried to relate the one hundredth part of the glorious story. To those who are interested—you have great libraries, I know—I would suggest that you read a book by Professor Callender, called "The Naval Side of British History," which will stir your blood with pride, though indeed, also with shame when you read of England's failure from time to time to realize that her honour and very existence depended on the maintenance of sea forces adequate to safeguard her shores and overseas colonies.

Alfred the Great was England's first exponent of sea power. "There is no advantage" he declared "in living in an island unless your navy rides in undisputed sway on the waters which surround it." Unhappily, as Professor Callender remarks, "The truth was spoken to a people slow to hear and quick to forget".

Centuries later, Shakespeare wrote "England bound in with the triumphant sea whose rocky shore beats back the envious surge of watery Neptune, is now bound in with shame, with inky blots and rotten parchment bonds"—which shows that Shakespeare even did not really understand the meaning of sea power, for neither rocky shores, the triumphant sea, nor watery Neptune, to say nothing of rotten parchment bonds will be of any avail in this wicked unchanging world of ours, if an island dependent from day to day on sea-borne food and raw materials neglects to maintain, to quote Alfred, the Truthteller, "A navy which rides in undisputed sway on the waters that surround it", and I would add "connect it with its far flung Empire".

Every English girl and boy has read with pride of the brave sea stories of the Elizabethan age so I will not dwell on the glorious achievements of the great English sailors of those days—Hawkins, Grenville, Drake, Frobisher and Raleigh, or on the destruction of the Invincible Armada, which set out from Spain to make England a Spanish colony and was defeated by the valour and skill of English seamen despite the folly and parsimony of Elizabeth's government.

How many can tell you anything about the sea history of the next half century? The defeat of the Spanish Armada is always regarded as decisive; nevertheless the war dragged on for 16 years, without much government help, it is true, but the enterprise of our merchant adventurers continued to defy the might of Spain. The war had arisen because British subjects claimed the right to trade overseas and to do so without the risk of suffering imprisonment, mutilation or death at the hands of the Inquisition or lifelong slavery in the galleys of Spain. When Elizabeth died in 1603 and was succeeded by James VI of Scotland, there was a "peace at any price" party, and a small war party of which Raleigh was the chief exponent. He had expended the greater part of his fortune in establishing a colony—Virginia—and saw visions far beyond his day of a great colonial empire across the Atlantic. Through the intrigues of the Peace

Party, Raleigh was confined to the Tower and in 1604 peace followed. It can hardly be said that James made peace for he acquiesced in everything the Spaniards demanded. Twelve years later, in a fit of annoyance with Spain, James released Raleigh and with Government approval, but at his own expense, Raleigh equipped a commercial expedition to an unoccupied part of the world. This infuriated the Spaniards who threatened James with dire displeasure if Raleigh was permitted to live on his return, and, incredible as it may seem, James sent that gallant English seaman to the block at the bidding of Spain.

Those were days of black shame and indelible humiliation. James could not understand the necessity for guardian fleets; he associated warships not with the police functions of sea power but only with operations of war, and since the war was over and peace restored, such expensive playthings seemed to him no longer necessary. And what is far worse, this view was generally accepted in England. When Charles I succeeded James in 1625, our Maritime power was at its lowest ebb; hundreds of British seamen were undergoing lifelong slavery in Spanish and Algerian galleys. Piracy flourished, no English harbour was safe from alien insult. Pirates infested the lower reaches of the Thames and Severn. Portsmouth was entered by ships which levied blackmail; the citizens of Plymouth were carried off by alien privateers to serve before the mast; the west of Ireland and south of England were raided by Barbary pirates in search of galley slaves. The Dutch seized the heritage which England had surrendered. Holland sent out fishing fleets 2000 strong, accompanied by warships which destroyed or drove off British fishermen who had the temerity to fish in British waters. They massacred one British colony and drove out another from the East Indies. They established New Holland in the heart of New England; they chased us out of our whaling grounds, hunting Englishmen and whales alike, ejected our merchants from the Russian trade they had founded, used our harbours as they liked and patrolled our estuaries, until British trade practically ceased and not an English merchant would trust his cargoes in English ships. Charles I realized that steps must be taken to save the State and in 1634 he launched his unpopular scheme of raising Ship Money, the first statesmanlike plan for the upkeep of Britain's navy—the inland towns did not realize that sea power and sea commerce meant something—since it involved not only all the inland places, but the seaports as well, in the entire state. It was violently resisted by people who didn't see the necessity for it; it was declared illegal and his foresight played no small part in his ultimate discomfiture, and ultimate murder—he also went to the block. The unsanctioned tax, however, enabled the King to build a few fine ships and for a time the situation to some extent improved, but in 1639, a Spanish fleet carrying troops to the Spanish Netherlands paid Charles for the escort of his small Ship Money fleet. While British and Spanish ships were at anchor in the Downs, Tromp, the Dutchman, fell on the latter and, of the 77 Spanish ships, 70 were destroyed, while the small English squadron lay powerless to protect them. England simply did not count. Had not her people objected to the King's efforts to raise sufficient money to build five warships at a time when Holland had over one hundred?

Now, let us leave this shameful period which lasted 45 years and turn with pride and relief to the deeds of a gallant English seaman, Robert Blake, whose indomitable courage, enterprise and skill lifted Great Britain in a few short crowded years from the depths of degredation to the very pinnacle of European Maritime power, prestige and prosperity.

In 1649, Cromwell, realizing the vital importance of rebuilding British maritime power, took measures which brought English seamen flocking back from foreign service to take part in the glories to come. Blake was fearfully handicapped by his inferiority both in numbers and the quality of his ships but his dauntless skill challenged overwhelming odds. A successful campaign to the Mediterranean brought Spain and Portugal to heel, the destruction of a superior French fleet off Dunkirk brought about French recognition of the Government, but at the commencement of 1652, Holland with whom we were still at peace, was the greatest maritime power the world had yet seen and controlled the seas all over the world.

It has always been a sea custom for the ships of all nations on entering the waters of a foreign power to salute her flag. In England's hour of adversity her flag was treated with contempt. Blake's victories brought about the revival of the custom, and foreign ships which forgot their manners received drastic correction. Tromp, who commanded the Dutch fleet, was not slow to take up the challenge and in May 1652, with 42 ships, he stood into the Downs, the scene of his great triumph in 1639, and proceeded to carry out battle practice—a crowning insult in English waters in a period of profound peace. Happily, Blake was at hand with 13 ships, and without a moment's hesitation, he demanded the salute. Tromp replied with a contemptuous broadside and hoisted the signal for battle. Blake was thus opposed to the greatest fighting seaman of the day in an inferiority of one to three. Fortunately, he received a reinforcement of eight ships during the action, and when darkness separated the combatants he was left in possession of the field with two Dutch prizes.

But this all belongs to one of our glorious pages and it will suffice to remind you that Blake in his wonderful career suffered one severe defeat at the hands of Tromp, who was an overwhelming superiority. This raised rather than lowered Blake's prestige and gave him an opportunity of pointing out to his Government that it was unfair to expect our reinforced merchant vessels to fight Tromp's battleships and he insisted if he was expected to retain his command, that sufficient battleships should be built to overthrow the Dutch, and the Dutch had mobilized 150. When Charles asked for money to build five battleships, his subjects defied, insulted and eventually put him to death. But those who had resisted Charles' Ship Money now collected, under martial law and at Cromwell's command, sufficient to build all that was required.

In the Spring of 1653, Blake inflicted a decisive defeat on Tromp, and in July that brave and dauntless Dutch seaman fought his last battle. A chance bullet ended his victorious career and at the same moment ended forever the arrogant Dutch dominion over the waterways of the World.

It is a curious but an indisputable fact that the cycle of decline, fall and resurrection of British maritime power, of which I have tried to give you an example, is repeated over and over again in our Island's history. We are indeed a people slow to learn and very quick to forget.

In 1763, on the conclusion of the Seven Years War, the preamble of the Peace Treaty of Paris ran: "There shall be a Christian, universal and perpetual peace,"—and at that time we possessed a powerful and victorious Fleet, commanded and manned by a splendid personnel. In a few short years that great legacy was dissipated and we drifted into the next war almost disarmed, suffered terrible humiliation and the next Peace was signed in one of the blackest hours of British history.

If Disarmament is the solution of the distressing problem we are all so anxious to solve, no one can say that we have not given a lead in the right and proper use of armed forces in peace time and in this connection I would like to remind you of an episode which won for us the unstinted and outspoken gratitude of the Nationals of every civilized country—I refer to the timely arrival of British troops and ships at Shanghai when a vast cosmopolitan colony was in immediate and desperate danger, and it was thanks to the arrival of a little British fleet and a division of British soldiers and the staunch, hearty, stiff-lipped Admiral, Sir Reginald Tyrwhitt that what might have been a terrible disaster was peacefully solved. It was the readiness of our armed forces which averted blood shed and prevented war and, incidentally, raised our waning prestige in the Far East.

There were a number of victories. We remember the victories of the Nile and Trafalger but we forget the anxieties we went through in other times. In 1779, after the Seven Years War, the Spanish and French fleets sailed unchallenged up the channel. England was in terrible danger. Our history is full of examples of our sea force being allowed to disappear and decay because the political horizon, for the moment, was clear. Our history establishes without a shadow of a doubt that our prosperity and prestige have risen and fallen in direct relation to our maritime power. At the end of the Great War, the prestige of the British Empire was at is zenith. Had not the hammer blows of the British Army been the decisive factor? Had not British maritime power in the face of unseen and unprecedented difficulties kept the seas and carried troops from every outpost of our Empire and from the United States of America to the various theatres of war?

I hope I have not wearied you. I could go on for hours talking about this sort of thing. I was told to talk forty minutes. I think I have talked forty-five. At any rate, I will spare you ancient history, but I think I have told you enough history to show you that sea power which is, in other words, maritime commerce and sea communication with the Empire and the ability to give them indisputable protection are as vital to the people of the Empire as the air we breathe and that prosperity, security, and peace follow in Sea Power's wake.

I would like to close this part by repeating what Raleigh wrote more than three centuries ago: "I confess that

Peace is a great blessing of God, and blessed are the Peacemakers, and therefore, doubtless, blessed are those means whereby peace is gained and maintained; to which means of our defence and safety being shipping and sea forces........" He wrote that when in prison. As you know, that gallant knight, the pioneer of our first colonial expansion, was beheaded by the King of Spain when our sea power was at its lowest ebb.

I am told by your President that you would like to hear something of the situation today. I will tell you, briefly. At the end of the War, we had an enormous fleet, with great personnel. Its prestige was as high as at the end of the Seven Years War—perhaps, higher because it was more world wide. It was absolutely necessary to do something to cut down the vast expenditure on naval armaments and we started right away by scrapping all sorts of ships which were good for many, many more years of valuable service. That went on for about two years. In 1916, before America had come into the War, America had started a program which included the building of sixteen capital ships and at the end of the War, we had started to build superior ships—far more powerful than the ships America was building. Something had to be done. We had to stop the expenditure of money on capital ships which were necessary adjuncts to sea power but which could be limited by agreement. Hence, the Treaty of Washington. We all made sacrifices to bring about a Treaty acceptable to all the maritime powers. Great Britain suggested the abolition of the submarines. Other nations did not want to do away with submarines, so we accepted that. We said that we must be able to build such craft as is necessary to deal with submarines of other nations because we had our great sea trade to protect. Other nations—not France and Great Britain but other nations—were building cruisers far more powerful than the cruisers we were building. France and Great Britain suggested that the size of the cruisers should be limited and the power of their guns limited, but no nation can make a sacrifice that jeopardizes its own security. I have come to that conclusion and I do not think that Mr. Flandin will quarrel with me about that.

So we maritime nations accepted certain cruisers which carried guns of a heavier calibre than we thought necessary. We safeguarded ourselves by pointing out that we had this far greater responsibility for the protection of our trade than any other nation and everybody agreed—France, Japan and America—and we were left free to build such cruisers as we considered necessary for our protection.

In a misguided moment, when the Socialist Government came into power, all the safeguards were swept away by the Treaty of London. We had made out a tremendous case after a very severe battle at which I assisted. It was a battle of four statesmen under the presidency of Lord Birkenhead, and we sailors made out a case to have a certain number of cruisers—seventy cruisers. With a stroke of the pen, the extraordinary people in power in 1931 limited us to fifty—fifty cruisers—and the French walked out, because that meant, by their quota, perhaps twenty-five or thirty. They had no intention of jeopardizing their security nor did they. And we had to mark time while America and other nations who hadn't as many cruisers and who demanded parity, built up their force.

The situation is now that not only by the Treaty of London are we prevented from having more than fifty cruisers, but by the extraordinary terms, we are not even allowed to replace more than a certain proportion of tonnage and when the Treaty comes to an end as it will next year—I went into Parliament to try to help it to—we shall have fourteen cruisers simply unfit to meet the cruisers of other nations which have been building while we have been marking time. Of the 150 destroyers we are allowed, 44 of them will be obsolete and unfit to meet the destroyers which other nations have been building.

There was a very good example at Gaspe. While we were restricted from building ships the size of the Saugenay, France was very wisely building something stronger, far superior to anything we are allowed to build. Germany is building pocket battleships—France, the United States, Great Britain and Japan and Italy are not allowed to build them. There is something so foolish in these trammelling bonds. We must get free of them and free to build just sufficient to protect our sea communication.

I was told when I ran for Parliament that I was trying to build up a great war navy to make another war. I tell you, we who saw war are more anxious than anybody to try and ensure that there shall be no war but we mean to see our country secure. To France, an army is an absolute necessity. To England, a navy is an absolute necessity. To France, certain sea forces are absolutely necessary. To us, our military forces to police our great Empire are also necessary. We must be free to build what we consider necessary for our own security. I believe other people are coming to the same conclusion. It is out of the question to go on disarming when other nations are wise enough, in the interest of their security, to pay no attention and to go on building their fleet, while we mark time.

I am not asking, but I am demanding, that these obsolete ships be replaced. It is not fair to ask our fleet to guard our sea power with such limited forces. That is why I have come into more or less public life—to make England realize that it has got to put its defences in proper order if it wishes to be the heart of this great Empire in this great Commonwealth of Nations in which you are united by the throne of King George. (Hearty Applause).

PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, we are doubly honoured today, by the presence of the Guest of Honour, Sir Roger Keyes, and also the presence of Monsieur Flandin, Minister of Public Works in the Government of France.

I had been informed by the authorities of the Canadian National Exhibition that Monsieur Flandin would be at their luncheon today and would not be available to attend here but I was very pleasantly surprised to find that he has overcome all obstacles and he is here. I wish, therefore, to call on Monsieur Flandin to address the Club and say a few words to you at this point. (Applause).

MONSIEUR FLANDIN: I must first apologize for my very bad English. You were told that I was able to speak in English, but these first few words will make you acknowledge that it is not quite true. I came to be here and I wanted to be here for two reasons. The first one was that I wanted, not only for myself but on behalf of the French Government to show how we agree with what you are doing here. That means keeping the bonds between Great Britain and the Dominions as tight as possible. The second was the opportunity to hear Sir Roger Keyes—for a little more than a week I have gone on sitting next Sir Roger Keyes and having listened to some of his speeches—of course, he had also to listen to my speeches—I was quite sure that listening to him today, I would learn something, because Sir Roger is always teaching when he speaks, especially to French people.

I have nothing, of course, to add to what he has said—only this: France hopes, very sincerely, that the British Empire will always keep strong on the sea because we have the same desire for peace and we know that the British power ruling the seas is the best guarantee for peace in the world. Of course, we would all be glad to disarm, as largely as we can, but every one must think of his own security, and the sense of peace must not be only unilateral before we disarm—we must have in the world a common want of peace and I am not quite sure that this is, for the present, the sentiment of all people. I hope it will come in the future but until it has come, I think the best way to prevent wars is not to tempt by weakness those who could attack you. It is wise. We have organized our frontiers in France only in the spirit of self defence and it is wise, we think, that we keep our power and we hope that Great Britain and the British Empire shall keep its power on the sea and more, perhaps, also on the land, indirectly.

I don't want to keep you longer. You are very busy. My friend, Sir Roger Keyes and I—if I dare say so—made so many speeches that I am not very keen to make one more. I conclude, thanking you very heartily for your reception and hoping that the Empire and Canada will always be prosperous. (Applause).

A BRITON LOOKS AT THE WORLD

AN ADDRESS BY REV. FREDERICK W. NORWOOD, D.D.

September 18, 1934

MR. DANA PORTER, President of The Empire Club, introduced the Guest Speaker, REV. FREDERICK W. NORWOOD, D.D.

PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, it has been said that during the recent ears of economic, political and spiritual depression that the lights have gone out all over the world. Our guest today, Dr. Norwood, of the City Temple, London, comes to Toronto under the auspices of the Deer Park United Church. He has just completed an eighteen months tour of the world. He has seen many countries; he has met many thousands of people and he has observed them under the unusual conditions that prevail throughout the world at the present time.

Dr. Norwood, himself, is an Australian by birth. During the war he happened to be in London and was asked to preach at the City Temple. Very shortly after that occasion he was called to the City Temple and has been the pastor there ever since, coming direct from a small church in Australia to the very centre of the church to which he belongs.

Dr. Norwood has told me that in his world travels the thing that interests him most is the reaction of world forces and the great changes that are going on today upon the mind of the ordinary man. In Dr. Norwood, we have an exceedingly great pastor and one of the few giants among the masters of the spoken word. It is with great pleasure that I call upon Dr. Norwood. (Applause).

Dr. Fbederick W. Norwood: I called my talk, "A Briton Looks At The World". I have been, so to speak, looking around its back premises. I do not use the term in any derogatory sense, but it has seemed to me very often that our Western civilization is probably obsessed with its own grandeur and glitter and may not be sufficiently aware of the radical changes that are taking place in the other parts of the world. At any rate, I felt a sudden impulse to break away from London and wander about these other countries, as casually as possible. Indeed, I did not organize this tour, except in the most meagre fashion. I wanted to go and test out a few great convictions which have been maturing in my mind for years.

I would not like you to think that what I am to say now is the mere outcome of sixteen months of travel; rather the sixteen months of travel were an inevitable outcome of twenty-five years of study and reflection.

I want you to allow me to state my case from a somewhat personal point of view. I do that for the sake of clarity. I am, myself, the son of Australian pioneers. My grandfather was swinging a pioneer's axe on the plains where the City of Adelaide is standing today. Nearly a hundred years ago, he purchased fifteen acres of ground in the heart of the present city for fifteen dollars, and being a shrewd man of business, he sold them for twenty-five dollars. By his foresight, I was delivered from the peril of lapsing into the ranks of the idle rich.

I think that I must have the blood of the pioneers, or buccaneers or missionaries in my veins, because as long as I can remember, I wanted to see the world. The most popular book in my boyish imagination was the atlas of the world, and many a time for long hours have I poured over that as a child, using the point of a pencil to represent my ship sailing, always from an Australian port but visiting every corner of the globe.

Now, I can see that atlas before my eyes, as a mature man, as distinctly as if it were on the table before me, and I remember that I got the impression as a child that the world virtually belonged to Europe or was in process of so belonging. It didn't matter where you turned the pages of the atlas, you could tell at a glance to what European country that particular country belonged. Indeed, to simplify the matter, there was a kind of graduated colour scheme printed on the margin of each page, a kind of key so you always knew at a glance what European country any quarter of the globe belonged to or was dominated by. There was, of course, the British red, and a great deal of it! There was the French mauve, the Russian green, the Dutch yellow, and the Belgian purple, and so on. As for the red, it looked as if some careless painter had been wandering around the world with a pot of paint, dropping great daubs of it in the most casual fashion imaginable. There was a great daub, of course, over more than half of the continent of North America. Australia was entirely red; so was New Zealand and South Africa was intensely red at the southern tip and was afflicted with a kind of measles toward the north.

There was a number of small wars in my boyhood. There was the Zulu war and the Sudan war, and all the rest of them and after each one, the red went farther on the road to Cairo, so Cecil Rhodes seemed an inevitable Messianic prophet when he talked of the "Red route from Cape to Cairo".

But not all of Africa was red; there were great splashes of gold and yellow and purple and other colours. Stanley had just written a book, entitled, "Darkest Africa". I had read it but Africa did not look dark in my atlas. It rather looked like a barber's pole. Wherever the European settled, his colour spread, frequently from coast to coast. India was not entirely red, though mainly red. There were patches of neutral colour to indicate the Indian states. They were always firmly outlined with red. China was a parti-coloured country. There were all manner of European colours there to indicate what were called spheres of influence. The greater number of the islands of the sea were red. Some of them were so small that you could scarcely get a red spot on them but the smaller the island, the longer the name, as a rule, and *always* the name was firmly underlined with red. Indeed, there were only two countries on the map, as I remember, that used to puzzle me concerning their place in the colour scheme. One was in the west; the other was in the east. The one in the west was a little known country, rather under the shadow of Canada, called the United States. It wasn't red, though I understand—indeed, I was taught—that all their original people were British and had crossed in a ship called "The Mayflower". They spoke the same language, though, God knows, with not the same accent—a phenomenon for which, I have observed since, both nations are equally thankful. They were chiefly remarkable to me for Red Indians and cowboys and for an extraordinary habit they had, whenever a ruler died, instead of solemnly accepting the eldest son of the deceased as civilized people ought to do, they plunged the whole country into a Presidential election and then, the day after, set to work to select his successor. But we never thought of them in my boyhood except as near British, as certain liquids were near beer. (Laughter).

The other indefinite country was Japan. Apparently the map makers were not sure how to colour that. But still we understood that the Japanese were as busy as bees imitating everything we had and since imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, it seemed that they were very nearly European.

That was in the heyday of the Victorian era and it seemed exactly as it ought to be for was not Europe the greatest of all the continents? Had she not wealth, culture, science, mechanical prowess, commerce, ships, and troops, and, best of all, was she not Christian Europe? Had she not the one and only religion for the world?

I am giving you the unsophisticated ideas of an Australian busy boy and I am bound to say that I really believed that the world either belonged to Europe or was rapidly in process of so belonging.

Well, later I began to study history and I learned how that phenomenon came to be for it really was a wonderful achievement. I have said for many years now that one of the most significant dates in history was the year 1453. In that year the Turk captured Constantinople and when he did that he closed the Mediterranean Sea. No longer could peaceful traders venture that way looking for the wealth of India. So the world then began to dream of other ways of reaching India, rather than that way. Indeed, it was the lure of India that put the world on the map and made even my atlas possible.

Europe faced west, dreaming of the East. Europe turned south, still dreaming of the East. The Portuguese threaded their way down the Western coast of Africa and Vasco da Gama rounded the Cape and turning north again, found India. Christopher Columbus, believing the world was round, sailed west, hoping to reach India and believed he had done so when he stumbled across America. He called the little islands he discovered the West Indies, supposing them to be just off the coast of India. He called the aboriginal people he found, Red Indians. We call them so still, though they have nearly disappeared. They called the aborigines they found in South America, Indians, and we keep the word yet—South American Indians.

Columbus, however died a broken-hearted and discredited man because while everybody believed he had found India, they couldn't find the big cities, the flashing jewels, the sweet spices which they knew to be there.

Meanwhile, the Dutch were following the Portuguese, and the English and the French followed after them and all the world began to be discovered until at last in the year 1774, Captain Cook stumbled over Australia and New Zealand and added them to the British Crown, without a struggle. A sheer gift was dropped into the lap of the old mother when she was looking the other way. And with that achievement, it may be said that the earth was unveiled. The lure of the East had put the Americas on the map, had shed light upon dark Africa, had unveiled Australia and New Zealand, until nowadays, there isn't a corner of the earth, so far as I know, left to be discovered. Indeed, there is no longer any need for laborious explorations through forests and jungles. We can fly over any portion of the globe. There wasn't left a corner of the earth that hadn't a flag on it. I notice that even Commander Bird, down near the South Pole, somewhere, heads his letters, "Little America", and not long ago, His Majesty, the King, evidently considered that the Australians hadn't enough land, and added a patch of the Antarctic to the Commonwealth. There isn't a new point on the star yet, but we have a new province at the South Pole. If there should be a boom in ice cream, we will put a point on the star. (Laughter). There was not a corner of the earth that wasn't beflagged. Europe had mastered it, discovered it.

In the decade in which Captain Cook completed the process, virtually, by the discovery of the Antipodes, there were some very significant Scotsmen in Glasgow, not natives there, I think, but living there, and one was named James Watt, and he invented the steam engine and the other was named Adam Smith and he laid the foundation of political economy, with his book, "The Wealth of Nations", and at the moment when the geographical process was complete, the age of the machine came into being and Europe, following the lead of Adam

Smith, conceding that the great difficulty was scarcity, began to solve the problem of how to find the wealth of the world, how to bring it back to the centers of civilization and turn it into manufactured goods for the enrichment of society, for the building up of a great civilization and in that age we have been living until now.

There is no limit, apparently, to the power of the machine. We have even become terrified by it. It works so swiftly, so cheaply, so skilfully, that it often seems more dynamic and, as it were, more personal, than the poor mechanized human beings who feed its maw with raw materials. Scarcity no longer exists, Gentlemen, except as the result of maladjustment and, more frequently, of deliberate contrivance. We are just as much afraid now of abundance as our fathers were afraid of scarcity. I have travelled right round the globe within the last sixteen months and I declare that I haven't been anywhere, though the people spoke different languages, where they weren't really speaking about the same things, and they were saying, "Why are we hungry and wretched when wealth and productivity is staring us in the face?

Now, the next step, so far as my experience was concerned, was the Great War, and I pass it in a sentence. I took a little share in it, but I was always puzzled over and I was puzzled more than anything else, I think, with why it became a world war. Nobody meant that, nobody had the technique for it. The wildest megalomaniac never dreamed of a combination of events that would set seven-eighths of the human race plunged in slaughter and destruction. Why was it a World War? Why, because of what I have told you, because our fathers, by their valour and enterprise and acquisitiveness, had penetrated into every corner of the earth and set up all manner of interests and opened up all manner of avenues of association, and once that thing started in Europe, you couldn't stop it. It just pushed itself out until not only Europe but Asia, Africa, Australia and America demonstrated that we really had done the thing, we had made the world to be affiliated with the West.

And the next episode for me has covered all the post war years. I came out of that inferno with a blazing hate of war and a determination to live and strive for peace. I have been for fifteen years in a little hunting tower of a pulpit in the heart of London and I am unsophisticated sort of parson but trying to understand, and I have seen Europe engaged in a perpetual series of conflicts, each swearing their adherence to peace. Every responsible voice in the Continent, and, indeed, in the world, declaring that war was a futility, that another war would mean the end of our civilization, every nation swearing it didn't mean war, and yet unable to accomplish peace. I do not think that they are rogues and vagabonds any more than you and I are and we have all got a touch of it about us. I have come to think that we are not facing the facts really. We are obsessed—we think it is all a matter of guns and ships and troops and we do not realize that the seas are getting emptier and emptier and we do not realize that what we have really done with the outer world is to wake it up. And we do not realize yet that we built up that glittering civilization upon the raw materials and cheap labour of the distant world. We drew it all into our maw and became nabobs and masters of industry and the thing is altered. It is just not so, now.

What is Europe fighting about anyhow? Does anybody know? Is it a few paltry acres of disputed territory? Is that enough to deluge the world with blood again? I think not. But Europe has inherited several centuries of quarrels over the spoils of the world. You haven't forgotten, Gentlemen, that the Great War really began with a drive to the East. The great German obsession was, since the colonies had been secured to cross over the bridge near Constantinople and get a way down to the Badgad railway and get a new grip upon Asia.

Now, I solemnly believe that what is really the case with us is that we have come to the end of an era and we haven't yet got a technique for the new era we have created ourselves, by our valour and our enterprise. We beat scarcity but all the technique with which we conquered scarcity is invalid for the proper use of abundance. We have reached the condition now, Gentlemen, when anything that humanity sufficiently desired, resolutely desired, could be done. If Europe and the rest of the world meant to abolish poverty, poverty could not stay. If we meant to abolish disease, disease would have to go. We have got the technique but we haven't got a driving force. We haven't got a motive. We have no motive but the profit motive and our civilization motive is split in two by an irreconcilable paradox, one wing of which declares that in order to make things cheaply you must make in vast quantities; and the other wing declares that the only way to keep up prices is to create a scarcity, and how we can do those two opposite things, we do not seem to know.

May I sum it up in a symbol? When I was in South Africa, I got very interested in diamonds. Kimberley, as you know, consists of a group of craters out of which innumerable diamonds have been brought. Everybody knows that there are far more diamonds in those craters yet than have ever been gotten out of them but Kimberley is disengaged and most people think it will scarcely function any more, and the reason is not merely a temporary maladjustment in the market—there is another as well. There is a bit of land—a God-forsaken bit of territory. You can tell that when even our Empire didn't wish to control it! But Namaqualand is full of diamonds. They say that they lie in the soil above the rocks. A gentleman who spoke with authority assured me it might easily be possible for man to go out in the morning with a bucket on his arm and come back in the evening with his bucket full of diamonds and South Africa is alarmed to its very soul. What are you going to do about that? I cannot describe it from actual experience because they won't let a man like me get within miles of the territory. It is defended, defended rigorously, and little is said about it.

But, don't you see, Gentlemen, if the diamonds got loose, well, how would any Maharajah feel sure his crown was worth anything? What comfort would Lady Fitzdoodle have in going to the ball if she suspected, even suspected, that some artisan's wife might come across a diamond greater than her own? As you know, the only thing to do with very valuable diamonds is to make paste imitations and never wear the real ones. Now, personally, I, an unsophisticated parson, can imagine a lot of uses for quite ordinary people. I would just love to outline the veranda of my home with them. They would look beautiful in the moonlight. But I notice that you laugh and in your laughter is the wisdom of the ages. You know that profits would disappear and you cannot do anything without profits. Who said? Who said? God? Are you sure, Gentlemen? God? I don't think so.

We have put over a certain system, you see. We have got a certain technique which is disrupted without profits. That is all. And that might be tolerable if we let the world alone, but we never do that. We keep on prodding the world and waking it. We go to the East which, from time immemorial has been unchanging, and we prod it with our bayonets and infiltrate her with our commerce and she awakes.

When I was down in South Africa, I crossed a portion of the Kalahari Desert. I lost a motor car out there. We had a broken axle and we left it out all night. We piled the party on another motor car and broke the spring and arrived home next morning. The

Kalahari Desert is enough to give a man a nightmare, but anybody knows if you wanted to irrigate the Kalahari Desert the engineers would do it with gladness. They could turn the Zambesi over the Kalahari and alter the climate of Africa. The air, instead of blowing over that arid territory, would blow over a moist territory and the climate would be altered across the land.

I went into India and I saw a marvellous feat of engineering by which were reclaimed huge valleys, barren since the creation and the engineer, himself, took me around them and I was terribly thrilled. I suggested that they ought to make him a lord. That is the only way we have got of expressing values except by money. Either make a man rich or put him in the peerage. Gentlemen, he said, "Doctor, I fear we have made a mistake. It is a great bit of work, as you say, but it will make rice that cheap that there will be no market for it." I said, "Sir, have all the people got all the rice they need now. Don't they suffer from famine now?" He said, "Of course, that is not it. If rice becomes too cheap, who will plant it?"

I visited great tea plantations and when I congratulated the planters on the marvellous yield of his estate, he was always sad and told of his troubles, how all the tea planters agreed to sacrifice thirty-five per cent. of their crop to save the market.

I went to Australia, my native land, which I had not seen for seventeen years. My Australia is as big as the United States and hasn't the population of New York. When I was growing up I used to plead and wax eloquent about the possibilities in this country—that it might become the granary of the world. When I came back they were exhorting from the highest seats of authority to grow twenty-five per cent. less wheat or the bottom would fall out of the universe.

Wheat, wool, cotton, silk, rubber, rice, tea, coffee, sugar—every great staple thing in the world, we are afraid of. And as for manufactures, why there is no limit to what we could do if we wanted to do it. The only limit is in the absence of a motive. The motive is the profit motive. If we cannot make things pay, nothing can be done and it looks as if we cannot make them pay much more.

Gentlemen, as our fathers, five hundred years ago, set out to conquer the world, to unveil its mysteries and discover its treasure and relieve humanity from this haunting terror of scarcity, so we and our children will have to go out and conquer the world again and learn what to do with its abundance. Set science free; it is in chains now. All the best brains in the world are being diverted to purposes of slaughter and destructiveness. More than half of the wealth of the world is being spent on preparation for war. Every nation in the world, almost, is virtually bankrupt, except that it does not choose to consider itself so. The money that we flung away in the Great War was not money at all—it was only paper. It was theft, theft upon the future, taking away the birthright of the unborn, though it bears interest; it would bear interest if we had to offer it up to Satan at the gates of hell.

The technique won't do, Gentlemen, and we ought not to look too alarmed about it either. When I was back in Australia I thought of the few aboriginals whom I used to know in my youth and I imagined gathering them around the camp fire and saying: "O boys, white man in terrible difficulty. You boys know what it is not to have enough food, hunger within. White man's difficulty worse than yours. He has so much food he doesn't know what to do with it." And the black man will look at me and say: "Is the white man mad?" Yes, Sirs, we are mad. We have won a great battle; we have accomplished a great deed, but we are on the verge of a terra incognita, and everything we call a problem is really a blessing. Being a parson, you will allow me to say it is a gift of God. It would be a satire unimaginable if humanity went reeling down to hell because it had too much food, too much wealth, too much power.

No, Sirs, it is a bit more thinking we want and a bit more courage we want, and youth wants it most of all. There is a technique and if the technique were to be used there would dawn upon mankind an order of existence infinitely greater than anything the race has ever known before, passing the dreams of poets and of artists and of prophets. It might be the era that would break upon the race if we only had mastered the technique of abundance, and, if we love the Empire, Gentlemen, as we do, if we love it so much that we take it for granted and we can joke about it, we are so sure in our affection, then let us at least believe that the old Empire that has done so much in the conquest of the difficulties of the era that is now coming to an end, has yet got it in her mind and in he soul to give the sort of leadership the world is waiting for and reach the very climax of her glory by demonstrating that she can be a commonwealth of free peoples and that she can recognize the growing needs of subject races and that she can put the British qualities of patience and of courage to a nobler use than the fratricidal, bloody, ineffective storm of an insane war. As a Briton, looking round the world, I stand dazzled by the promise, refusing to be terrified by the portents. (Tremendous applause —followed by three cheers and a tiger for the speaker).

EMPIRE TRADE

AN ADDRESS BY VISCOUNT ELIBANK

Friday, September 21, 1934

At the special Luncheon Meeting of The Empire Club of Canada, held on Friday, September 21, 1934, the guest speaker was introduced by the President of the Club, Mr. Dana Porter.

PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, it is particularly appropriate that the Empire Club should entertain as its guest, Viscount Elibank, who will address us on the subject, "Empire Trade". The members of this Club are generally sympathetic to the idea that a flourishing and sustained trade amongst the nations of the Empire is conducive to general economic stability and our guest of honour today is particularly equipped to discuss this subject. For many years he has contributed in various ways to the public life of the Empire. He has travelled very widely throughout the Empire and has, before this particular trip, travelled extensively in our own country. At the present time he is Chairman of the Federation of Chambers of Commerce of the British Empire and The Empire Club is very fortunate, indeed, to have as our guest of honour today, Viscount Elibank. (Applause.)

VISCOUNT ELIBANK: Mr. President and Gentlemen: I can assure you that it gives me the greatest pleasure to come and address you this afternoon, as well as to come back to this city of Toronto, to one of, if not the most important commercial centre of this great country.

Gentlemen, I am going to confess to you at the outset that I did not come to Canada to make speeches. I came here, at almost a moment's notice, on private business, but as I landed on the wharf at Quebec, a telegram was thrust into my hand, a telegram that I believed might be from a sorrowing wife I had left behind me, but that telegram was from your President asking me to address The Empire Club here. Well, Gentlemen, I accepted that invitation somewhat reluctantly, I admit, because I did not know what time I would have to prepare an address which would be appropriately fitting for such an important club as yours. However, I believed that you would forgive me and excuse me and pardon me if I did not prepare the address which I believed would have been more fitting but if I came here and just spoke to you of some of the thoughts I have in my mind on the subject which is forming the thesis of my remarks.

I must confess in addition that when I got your President's cable, or another upon the following day, asking me what subject I would select, I was just hurrying out of the Ritz Carlton Hotel to an important meeting, so I hurriedly wrote a telegram and I said, "Empire Trade and Cognate Matters". But, Gentlemen, your President has accepted only one part, "Empire Trade", and left out, "Cognate Matters". But I am going to ask your indulgence and supposing I do not concentrate entirely on Empire trade, but speak on certain ancillary matters which I believe are bound up with Empire trade, then I hope you will understand.

Now, Gentlemen, as your President has said, this is not my first visit to Canada. Indeed, the first time I visited Canada was twenty-six years ago, when I was very much younger man than I am today, but just at this time two years ago I was privileged to be present at Ottawa during the whole of those proceedings and at that same time I took the opportunity to travel across the continent and I visited every important city from Montreal to Vancouver and back from Vancouver to Montreal, all north and south, if I may say, of the railway line and, in addition, I was privileged to be the guest of honour of the

Canadian Chamber of Commerce at Halifax that September.

Well, Gentlemen, during that progress across the continent I had the greatest opportunity of meeting a great many people and learning a great deal about the potentialities, the resources and the opportunities which existed in Canada. So, when in the remarks which I make today I do refer to certain Canadian aspects, you will understand that I have taken every opportunity I could to learn something of your conditions.

Well, now, the first thing I want to say is that so far as the Ottawa Conference is concerned, that I believe there are no apologies to be made. My view is that the Ottawa Conference was one of the most successful conferences that has ever taken place, not inside the Empire but within the world. There were nine large entities, if I may describe them as such, represented at that Conference, and within the short space of thirty days, those nine large, important entities came to conclusions upon their trade and commerce which have not only affected the situation since that time, during the last two years, most advantageously, but are going on doing so.

Take Canada: Canada has increased her trade within the Empire enormously since that time. Only this month, yesterday, I saw in a number of newspapers, references to the fact that the August figures of export trade for Canada had gone up by nearly $11,000,000. But, Gentlemen, this is the most significant fact, of those figures nearly $9,000,000. of that $11,000,000 was an increase in exports to the United Kingdom. (Applause.) Nearly the whole of the other $2,000,000. of exports were within the Empire.

But I do know that there are certain criticisms levelled against these agreements. There are criticisms levelled in the Old Country against these agreements and perhaps more criticisms are levelled than over here because our trade with Canada, our trade with other dominions, has not increased to the same extent as the trade from the

Empire has increased with us. But, Gentlemen, that does not disturb me in the least. I, with such knowledge as I possess of different parts of the Empire—and I did at one time live in Australian waters, I lived in South Africa for five years and I know something about this country and I have been in most other countries—have no illusions about the future of these great dominions. I know for sure, for certain, that they have only been scratched; they are just in their infancy and their great futures lie before them. Therefore, if today the United Kingdom, the Mother Country, that has given these great advantages for the moment is not reaping the same reward, nevertheless, I see in the future when these countries, when Canada, for instance, will have developed in her population and her resources—her mining, her agriculture, her timber and so on—that in that time will the Mother Country reap the reward for such concessions as she gave at Ottawa over and above what appeared to be reasonable at the present time. So, as I say, that does not disturb me in the least, nor does it disturb a great many of the real thinking people of vision in the Old Country because they, like myself, have studied these things and see them in their true perspective.

But I know that there is certain criticism in Canada with regard to the development of our agricultural position in the United Kingdom. I know that the system of quotas which is being applied to agriculture in Great Britain has formed the subject of considerable controversy over here in the light of the agreements which were arrived at in Ottawa because this has meant that the quotas which were arranged at that time have had to be somewhat reduced so far as the export of agricultural products from this country to the Old Country are concerned. But, Gentlemen, I want to put to you the case of agriculture in the Old Country. Agriculture has never been in such a collapsed condition as it is today. Many farms are almost derelict and I would preface this by saying that, after all, agriculture is the biggest individual industry in the Old Country. Many farms are derelict. The product of these farms is being sold at a loss and farmers and small holders are not able to make their way and many of them are going into bankruptcy. Others do not know how long the banks—and the banks have been very kind—will go on sustaining them.

Well, there is one thing which I do not think is recognized here sufficiently. So far as the production of agricultural products in Great Britain is concerned, we will never be able to farm, as any one can see today, we will never be able to produce sufficient for our own requirements. With wheat, I think it is something like twenty per cent., and right along the line except, perhaps, in oats which we grow principally in my own country, Scotland, but all along the line, we can only produce a comparatively small percentage of those products which we require for consumption, both in the homes and on the farms, for feeding stock. So, Gentlemen, there has always been a very large surplus of requirements from overseas and in that surplus, we hope that Canada, Australia, South Africa, will always take the very largest share. But it is important, at least, that the produce which is grown in our country for our own people, that that comparatively small percentage should be sold at a figure in the country which will pay for the labour and for the natural reasonable profit the producer must have upon his labour and that is a problem which we are attempting to deal with through this question of quotas. We have done it successfully with wheat. The only product which is paying the farmer today is wheat. How have we done it? We have said that so far as wheat is concerned that—I forget the exact percentage—from twenty to twenty-five per cent of our wheat requirements will be produced in Great Britain. We have a duty on wheat coming in from outside. There is a preferential duty for the dominions. Anything received in the form of that duty is handed over for the purpose of making up the difference of the so-called world price and a price quota which will pay the farmer to grow that wheat. I think it is something like thirty-two shillings or something like that.

Well, Gentlemen, that is the system of quotas and duties and that is the system which I think would gradually be applied through the different products and I do not think that any one of you will quarrel with that. After all, the policy that you must look after your own people first, then the Empire, then your foreign countries, is a policy which has been adopted now practically throughout the Empire and it is even contained in the spirit of the Ottawa agreements, and so long as you know that whatever is over—and that is a huge quantity because it runs into hundreds of millions of pounds, something like three or four hundred million pounds—about a billion dollars—so long as you know that what is over is yours, as far as you can give it, I feel sure you will believe you are getting a square deal. (Applause.)

Well, that Gentlemen, I think deals with that particular question.

As I said at the beginning, the Ottawa Conference took place. There were nine nations and one short month in which they could lay the basis of a plan which they did, and did successfully. Obviously, out of that plan, as time went on, there was bound to arise certain inequalities and difficulties and problems. Now, Gentlemen, next year there is to be assembled in London, distingushed people from all over the Empire, indeed, from many parts of the world, in order to celebrate the Silver Jubilee of the accession to the throne of our King, King George V. All of us think—I know that the Federation of Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, so far as their Executive is concerned, and I know that the London Chamber of Commerce also thinks along the same lines, that that opportunity should be taken on that occasion, after those celebrations because the Premiers of the dominions will be assembled in London at that time and it would be the most opportune occasion for having a further conference upon these Ottawa agreements.

I only venture here in this City, to throw out that suggestion in support of a resolution which is being moved in London in the course of the next two or three days, at the Autumn meeting of the Association of the British Chambers of Commerce at Norwich, because I hope that it may come to the notice of your Premier and if your President supports that in such remarks as he may make directly, I feel sure, speaking on behalf of such a representative body here, and myself, speaking on behalf of the Federation, and the London Chamber of Commerce, that at least the Government of the United Kingdom and the Dominion might consider the desirability of doing this.

There is one question which has come up quite recently in Canada which, I think, is of enormous importance. I observed that at the Canadian Chamber of Commerce Annual Meeting at Winnipeg, which I, unfortunately, was unable to attend although I was privileged to receive an invitation for that occasion, that there came up for discussion the question of a trade agreement with the United States of America.

Now, Gentlemen, I am treading on delicate ground, perhaps, and I am going to tread delicately, and, if I can, diplomatically, and I hope when I have finished that I will have said nothing to which anybody can take objection. I did observe this, to begin with, that the newspapers next day, after this subject had been discussed, had huge headlines: "Reciprocity of Trade with The United States". Well, now, Gentlemen, that made me shiver a little because I cast my mind back to 1911, when I was governing a colony in the West Indies and, I might, say, at that time I was helping to frame the first Canadian-West Indies agreement, I remember the great campaign which waged through Canada and I read a great many of the Canadian newspapers in that time and I remember the fierce political controversies which were aroused here in Canada and in the United States as the result of it. So, I was sorry to see this word once more coming into prominence although actually I did not disagree with the intention. Actually, I see no more reason why Canada should not have a trade agreement with the United States of America than why the United Kingdom should not have an agreement with Denmark or with the Argentine. Obviously, when we came to Ottawa and entered into our trade agreements, we did not intend to shut out the rest of the world from our trade altogether. That would have been suicidal; it would have been foolish; it would have been unwise; it would have been, I venture to say, impossible, because the trade within the Empire is twenty-six per cent. of the trade of the Empire and, consequently, we have seventy-four per cent. of the trade outside the Empire. That is taking all the Empire countries together which we have to deal with, whether we like it or no. So there should be a trading agreement with the United States of America on such products, on such articles as you can trade to advantage. I see no reason to object to it, but I do want to suggest this and I say this for my own country, for the United Kingdom. I suggest that every country that is in the Empire, when making these trade agreements with other countries, have their heads turned back, looking at the trade agreements within the Empire, and that they do nothing when making those trade agreements that will harm or damage the trade agreements within the Empire. (Applause).

It would be perfectly ridiculous to say that you could cut off trade between Canada and the United States of America. Here you are with a large imaginary border with the necessity, owing to financial arrangements, of sending millions of dollars weekly over the border and down to New York, in order to pay interest on your loans and so on. You can only do that by payments in goods and services; therefore, the transfer back and forth of goods and services between Canada and the United States is absolutely essential and it is not possible to get along without it.

I only referred to this for that reason but I would like to say just one more word with regard to it. I had the opportunity of reading the most admirably clear and lucid pamphlet which was issued by the Canadian Chambers of Commerce under the aegis of the joint Canadian and United States Industrial Trading Committee which was set up by that body. I found these very interesting statistics: I found that Canada today is Number 2 among the customers of the United States of America and that she is taking 12 per cent. of the exports of the United States. On the other hand, I found that the United States of America is also Number 2 among customers of Canada, taking 32 per cent. of the Canadian exports. But then I came to the short paragraph that gave me more pleasure than anything else because I found that the United Kingdom comes first in both cases, taking 39 per cent. of Canadian exports, and 18 per cent. of the United States' exports. Well, Gentlemen, that points to the fact that in the long run, the United Kingdom is your best market and the market which you should go on seeking as far as you possibly can.

Now, there is a matter connected with trade which affects Empire trade all over the world. I refer to the monetary question. Now, you Gentlemen, all of whom, possibly, are engaged in commerce in one form or another, have no doubt been worried to death during the past four years, owing to the questions of exchange, its non-stabilization, its variation from day to day, the change in the value of the currency, the difficulties constantly connected with freight rates and all these matters which center around what I may call the monetary question.

But, Gentlemen, the Federation of Chambers of Commerce of the British Empire have taken great interest, as they must and as they had to do in this particular issue and before our Congress in London which took place two years ago, we had a very expert committee sitting upon this question upon which were representatives, not only of the United Kingdom, but of the different dominions. Well, the result of that committee's findings which were ultimately adopted by the Congress in the Guild Hall was that this main principle emerged. I may say that at that time there was sitting in London the International Economic Conference which was supposed to be considering this question and cognate issues for the whole of the world. But we, as an Empire body, had not very great faith in the results that that Conference was going to bring. We knew the difficulties we had within our own family in coming to an arrangement at Ottawa and we did not believe that that conference, composed of representatives of the whole world, was going to accomplish in four weeks what we had not been able to accomplish at Ottawa, because at Ottawa we were not able to come to any decision upon the monetary question. Well, Gentlemen, we considered this question and as a result of our deliberations we sent out a recommendation from that Congress, urging the governments of the Dominions to at least make a start toward the stabilization of exchanges, of currencies through the formation or the creation of a Sterling Union. I do not mean to suggest that there was any suggestion or idea of changing the currencies of the various dominions or the United Kingdom. The dollar would remain; the pounds, shillings and pence would remain, but that we should have a Sterling Union that would stabilize the exchanges upon a stabilized parity and start out trading together, knowing at least that our currencies have been brought together and that they were stable and that you would at least know where you were in that connection.

Well, now, whilst we put forward that proposal, we knew there was one great obstacle to it and that was that at that time the central banking system did not exist throughout the dominions. We had the Central Bank, of course, in London, represented by the Bank of England. There was South Africa which had he.

Federal Reserve Bank, but in Canada, New Zealand, and Australia, the central banking system had not been established. Now, all that has been changed. Today, the central banking system exists or will exist by the end of this year throughout the dominions, as well as in the United Kingdom and that is most important in connection with this monetary question because as soon as that is finally done, as it is being done, you will have the machinery, the expert mahinery, to discuss these questions of exchange, to arrive at parities and not only to do that but to carry them on and keep them stable.

That was why I, for one, while having no knowledge of the inside domestic policy of the banking system as vis-a-vis a banking system in Canada, was extremely glad to see that Canada had set up a Central Bank because now, Gentlemen, we can go as an entity, an Empire entity to your various governments and say we have got the machinery today and we would like to see the start of a Sterling Union made, at any rate to stabilize one-quarter of the world, so far as currency and exchange is concerned. (Applause.)

But I go one step further. There are certain countries, like the Scandinavian countries, the Argentine and one or two other countries like that who have already allied themselves to sterling and, consequently, if the whole of the Empire comes together we should probably have at least two-thirds of the world and the world's trade to begin with and that must make such an impression, as it would be the most wealthy part of the world's trade, as would force the issue in other countries. I further venture to say this: that that would form no obstacle to your trading with the United States of America because if you take sterling by itself, we have been able in the United Kingdom to keep our exchange more or less even for the last six months with the United States, in spite of the fact of all the troubles and difficulties and chaos which has been found in that country. Therefore, if we had the wider group of the Sterling Union, all the other countries in, and also the Scandinavian countries, it might be easier to keep an even keel with the United States and then, at last, and in probably not a great length of time, the United States would probably enter into a parity agreement with the sterling group.

I do commend this suggestion to you, Gentlemen, who are so concerned in it, who are so mixed up in business and the problems connected with it. I do commend it to you for your thought and if you believe that is right you should bring every influence you can to bear in every direction, in order to attempt to bring it to fruition.

Now Gentlemen, I have transgressed too long but these points which I have been privileged to bring to your notice today are, I believe, the most important connected with your trade matters today.

I once more say how glad I am to come back to Toronto. I hope it is not going to be my last visit because I find that every two years or so, my steps keep wandering back to this country. I want to thank you, Gentlemen, and you, Mr. President, for your kindly thought in asking me here and for the hospitalitable entertainment which you have given me today and I wish long success to this Club and that it may continue to bear the great influence which it has already accomplished. (Applause.)

President Porter: Gentlemen, it is very seldom that we have the privilege of having with us, as a guest at the head table, a Minister of His Majesty from the Federal Government at Ottawa. I have great pleasure in calling on the Honourable R. C. Matthews—in so doing I am breaking a precedent which has been observed in this Club—to propose a vote of thanks to the speaker.

Honourable R. C. Matthews: Mr. Chairman, my Lord, and Gentlemen: I felt quite concerned for his Lordship when he spoke of not having an address prepared before he came here and I was at a loss to know where he would get one. I don't know that I can explain it all but I can tell him now he got part of his address from one I delivered last night. Mine, however, happened to be purely political.

I am particularly interested, as a member of the Government, in the Empire agreements, because I happen to preside over the Department that has to do with exacting taxation, duties and that sort of thing, under the trade agreements which the Chairman described as conducive to economic stability and I would say at this time, are necessary to economic stability. We have a great deal to do with England. His Lordship has said that there have been criticisms of the agreements. That is so and there has been two kinds, as I see them: first, of all, from the standpoint of the broad features he has discussed, but, secondly, because of minor details in connection with putting them into force. I may say to him, however, that within the last few months these minor difficulties have mainly been straightened out because from the Department over which I preside we sent officers to England, men who were trained in business, men who knew the department's view, and after consultations with our friends abroad, we have now straightened out all the difficulties there have been in the administration of the preferences.

I quite agree with him that these agreements have been conducive to expansion of trade. A short time ago one of the chief industrialists of England came to my office and said that he wanted to meet me. I could not imagine why, but he said this. He said, "Do you know, some time ago and not very long, the word among the industrialists in England was, "Do business, but not with Canada'. Today, it is 'Do business with Canada first.' "

So many of these agreements have been conducive to our prosperity, which I shall not enlarge upon, that even our neighbors seem to be concerned.

I won't mention the United States, unless I venture to tell you this: I do not know whether it happened on his Lordship's ship or not. There was no clergyman on board and a very charming, delightful American was asked if he would take the service on Sunday morning. He consented to do so and when he came to the prayer for our Sovereign King George, he stopped a moment, then said, "And may the good Lord have mercy on the poor President of the United States." (Laughter.)

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very highly the honour you have given me of expressing our appreciation to his Lordship for his very charming and interesting address. (Applause.)

A WHOLE WORLD AGAINST US

AN ADDRESS BY PROFESSOR WILLSON WOODSIDE

September 27, 1934

MR. DANA PORTER, President of The Empire Club, introduced the guest speaker, MR. WILLSON WOODSIDE.

PRESIDENT: Lord Acton in his lectures on the French Revolution said, "It is not a meteor coming from the unknown, but it is the product of historical influences which by their union are efficient to destroy and by their division, powerless to construct." It may be, some day, that the historian, writing about the German Revolution will make some similar generalization. In doing so, however, he will have read a great many contemporary accounts of the events which we are now facing and among those chronicles he might find some personal records, written by our guest today, Mr. Willson Woodside. The historian of the future will be up against the very great difficulty of deciding, among all these various records that are placed before him, which are to be believed and which to be discredited. He will probably have to reject most of the records which are inspired by the German public of today.

We have with us today one who not only has come back from Germany as recently as this very month and has been in Germany during the events that have happened there and which are of world wide significance, but he also visited Germany regularly for the last three summers. He is a man of very acute observation, one who is accustomed by his profession to approach knowledge from the scientific point of view, so that his observations, his impressions, his conclusions will be of very great interest to us and, possibly, of very great interest to those who have to deal with this subject sometime in the future.

It is with very great pleasure that I introduce Mr. Woodside.

MR. WILLSON WOODSIDE: Mr. President, and members of the Empire Club:

Mr. Porter has, I assure you, far over-rated the value of my chronicles of Germany and the Nazi Revolution. It has been my singular good fortune to have been able to be in Germany before, during, and after the Hitler Revolution, with a return to Canada each time for mental re-adjustment.

For these are a people without a sense of humour, and good, plain common sense. They are the people who greeted each other in the morning, during the last war, with: "Gott strafe England!"; the people who on any occasion would sing the Hymn of Hate. It could only have been in Germany, surely that a person could be locked up for six months, as a feminine friend of mine was this summer, for replying to the common salutation of "Heil Hitler!" with "Heil drei Liter!" (which means "Heil! three glasses of beer," but rhymes very nicely!)

There was a little humour about Germany in this, but it was a grim sort of stuff. Someone told me, for instance, of two brothers, Hans and Karl, who had disappeared from home for three months. Finally a letter arrived—from a concentration camp. It was from Karl. "I like this place;" it went on briefly, "the food's fine. Hans complained about conditions here; he's dead now."

Then a Blackshirt friend told me that the day after the 30th June "Clean-up," when the Bown Shirt comrades were re-appearing, somewhat shaken, on the streets, the greeting beween them was not the salute and "Heil Hitler!", but "What! You still alive!"

It was a summer with plenty of opportunity for adventure. Why! the second day I was in Germany I met a man who was carrying on the Communist underground propaganda work for North Germany. We were to go out for a paddle on the lagoon the next Sunday in his Peterborough canoe, but when I arrived at his lodgings I found he had been arrested the night before. I was told afterwards that I had just missed a second visit of the Secret Police by twenty minutes.

I met another Communist in a bookstore in Berlin—Berlin and Hamburg seemed to be full of them. We were talking together at the back of the store, pretending to thumb through some books, when a high Police officer, stern-looking, with monocle in his eye and sword by his side, walked in. My companion's heart must have risen in his throat; "Oh! A Visitor." He had to assume a calm air and go and ask the Police Officer what he could do for him. The Officer only wanted a book on Bismarck!

That day I was to have lunch with three very high Storm Troop officers, in a fashionable Berlin hotel. When conversation had opened up properly, after lunch, I told them the experience in the bookstore. It amused them heartily! Scarce a fortnight later two of these companions were shot dead, and the other placed in a Concentration Camp!

During this big "Clean-up" of June 30th I was living in one of the large German cities most affected by it, with a trooper of the Black Guards. He was the finest young German I had ever met, I think, and had actually once spent a year at College in America. On June 30th he was one of a party ordered to shoot three Brown Shirts, in a house only two doors removed.

I left this Germany of mass executions only to arrive in Vienna in time for the Nazi uprising there and the assassination of Chancellor Dolfuss. It was a mad time, with soldiers camped in the main squares, armored cars patrolling the street, policemen with fixed bayonets, even the postmen and street car conductors carrying rifles.

The curfew rang at 8 o'clock and everyone had to be off the streets, except with a special police permit. It is a strange sight to see a great city utterly empty and dark at nine or ten on a summer's evening.

From Vienna I went to Salzburg, to the Music Festival. It wasn't very festive; music flourished indifferently in such an atmosphere of unrest. As soon as the guests had taken their places inside the Festival Theater a cordon of police would be quietly moved up. Back and forth they would patrol, watching the neighboring windows and roofs for bomb throwers. Then as the music-goers reappeared, they would quietly melt away. While Salzburg's guests watched "Everyman" in the Cathedral Square that afternoon, I had seen a group of Nazi rebels hustled into prison only 50 yards away!

I used to love Germany very much, but I am sure that as I crossed the border the next day I looked balefully at the patrol of Black Guards loafing about Freilassing station. Perhaps that is why I had several unpleasant experiences in Munich and was finally turned out of my hotel; I might have had a chip on my shoulder. One thing I know, I *would not* salute, and there seemed many memorials and celebrations in Munich which required saluting. However on my last evening I met a splendid German couple, had hours of good comradeship, and made two new friends for life. I had to set myself once more to distinguish between blustering, bullying Nazism and the Germany of friendly, hospitable people, of music and fairy tales, of the Rhine and Heidelberg. It was with very mixed feelings that I left the country.

My next stop was in the Saar. It was as if the clock could be turned back; you were once again in the Germany of pre-Hitler days. Here was a German city, with German signs everywhere and German kiddies about—but never a Brown uniform in sight, no Dictatorship, no bullies. One thought: How lucky these Saarlanders are! But it is likely their German blood will triumph over everything else when the Plebiscite finally comes.

And so at last I came to Paris and sanity.

Enough for reminiscing; now I should like to try to interpret to you the feelings of the average little German man in this year 1934. Does he want war, and does he still support Nazism? After these twenty long years all he wants is real peace at last, some rest and security. But he is the victim of the Government's unremitting, dangerous and often vicious propaganda. It's keynote is simple, and borrowed from the early days of Bolshevist Russia: "The Whole World Is Against Us." The German Fatherland is surrounded by an international clique intent on denying it a chance to live. The world is filled now, as it always has been, with an envy and hatred of everything German, and loses no opportunity to slander us.

To the German people as a whole, who are taught to *believe* rather than to *think,* and to the young men in the Storm Troops especially, this seems plausible enough. Consider this sum of a lifetime's memories, related to me this summer by a Trooper of 25, a fine, clean young boy with whom I have hiked and camped in better days: "My first memories, when I was five years old, are of my father marching off to war. Later, in the school, the teacher would tell us of how the whole world was united to kill little Germany. Then came those terrible years of hunger, when I was 8 and 9 and 10; it wasn't enough to fight the men in the trenches, now they were going to starve helpless women and children, too. How we hated the world then!

"I remember, when we would be out playing, seeing my little sister fall down in the street weak from lack of food. At school we could only have an hour's classes, and then half an hour's recess, because the children were so weak. At night we cried ourselves to sleep, we were so hungry.

"Then came the defeat. The soldiers straggled home dispirited, there was revolution and shooting, Germany seemed to be breaking to pieces. Now the French marched into the land, and brought coloured troops, to watch over German men and women. That is something we can never forget. Still we were hungry, but the Allies took away cattle and oxen and horses, our ships and our railway trains. They cut the Fatherland into two pieces, so that Germans had to go through enemy territory to get from one part of their country to the other.

"The Poles rushed in and tried to cut off the whole of Upper Silesia, while we were disarmed, and prevented from defending ourselves. The French came in and occupied our Ruhr. Then came the Inflation—that awful time; we lost everything, everybody seemed to lose everything; the world had gone mad. It was worse than the War.

"For a few years afterwards we had a sort of prosperity, but it was not a happy time for good Germans. Morals became worse and worse, foreign money was buying out our industries, everyone was looking after himself, and no one seemed to care about Germany. Soon came the World Crisis, millions of Germans were thrown out of work, but still the Allies demanded Reparations. The banks crashed, Communism grew rapidly, there was fighting in the streets every night...there was no hope for poor Germany...Then Hitler came, and called on us young fellows to get together, to clean all this up, to develop new, fresh strength and make Germany a fine country again."

There is the driving force behind Hitlerism—defiance of the world which caused them all this. These are the feelings upon which Hitler and Goebbels play so easily with their incessant propaganda of the outside world which envies and hates them. It starts early; let me translate for you from a book which I have here, telling the "history" of how the War started; it is intended for all young Germans of 7 to 8 years old:

"Many years ago, before you were even in the world.. Germany was a rich and mighty land. Everyone had his work, his home, enough to eat. The people were happy, and proud of their German Fatherland, in which everything was run so properly. Now around Germany there are other countries...In the time about which I want to tell you, when everything was so fine and wonderful in Germany, the French began to fear our cleverness, and became jealous. The English and the Russians became jealous, too.

"Often in those days the newspapers would print, 'A German has invented a new machine, which is especially good', or 'A German has built a factory, which makes things that are wonderfully fine and precise'. In the papers one could read, too: 'The Germans have built ships which sail wonderfully, and much faster than the others'. This, particularly, made the English angry, and they said: 'But we want to have the best ships!'

"And so, children, they decided that they would kill Germany. And how may one kill a big country? you may well ask. Ah! my young ones, that is something terrible. That is what one uses war for. Truly, so it came about: Because Germany was so industrious and so clever and had so many great and famous men, who made all kind of inventions, and created many beautiful things, because of all this, our neighbors became anxious, and said: 'We won't bear that Germany should be finer than we. We won't stand her being richer and greater and happier than we. We must kill her!'

"So all around us they brought their soldiers and cannons, and were all ready to shoot in on Germany. But our German soldiers were fine and brave; quickly they hurried to the borders, and never let the enemy in. They shot—which was all they could do—on the French and the English and the Russian and all the rest who had banded together to bring Germany down...

"Oh! Our soldiers were brave...For, children, the enemy brought ever more and more help. The Italians fought with them, and the Americans, and when these weren't enough to conquer Germany, they brought blackmen and brownmen from every corner of the world... But our soldiers built trenches, and never gave in an inch. They won many battles, and never once let the enemy in the Fatherland.

"Then a terrible thing happened. A bad spirit went about Germany, whispering in people's ears: 'Do you want to keep on fighting this war forever? You can never conquer so many enemies! Do you want to go on hungering forever, and sacrificing your husbands, sons, fathers, and brothers?...You are guilty of this war; you started it. Therefore you must stop it.' That was a lie, of course... But many poor tired Germans believed it... And when the Bad Spirit made them stop, they received many fine promises, but afterwards only terrible misfortune.

"Then the enemy went about the world shouting: 'We have won'; you Germans are guilty; therefore you must give us...."

From this point on, our fabled history becomes quite heart-rending. There is however a bright spot some pages further on, where it has occasion to mention the Fanco-Prussian War. 'Those were glorious days! When the Germans pushed the French back in a brilliant campaign, and marched into the capital city, Paris.'

Now you can better understand perhaps why Germany's youth, nurtured on such stuff, look upon Hitlerism as a great "freedom movement". Hitler is to them the Liberator of the Fatherland from Versailles. Forgotten and carefully buried from them is the fact that Stresemann secured the early evacuation of the Rhineland, Bruening the end of Reparations, and the Papen-von Schleicher regime the admission of German equality.

It is easy to understand how young people would be affected by such appeals to their emotions, but let me tell a story of how older people take it in too. A fortnight after the 30th June Clean-up I was in Upper Silesia making a study of the division of the territory under Versailles; I wrote an article entitled: "The Crying Injustice Of Upper Silesia." One evening I was sitting in a sort of Y.M.C.A. restaurant, having dinner with half a dozen gentlemen whom I had met about the place. The talk drifted in a friendly way from Canada to the N.R.A. and finally ended up on the partition of their Upper Silesia. Just at this point Goebbels was announced on the radio, and began a poisoned attack on the foreign press "who come here, ingratiate themselves, enjoy our hospitality, then go away and write a mountain of lies." Before he had began this attack it seemed that I had formed half a dozen new friends; now our little Entente was smashed. My "friends" shuffled uncomfortably in their chairs and busied themselves lighting up cigars, with not a word more to say. There was nothing for me to do but to excuse myself and go.

The Nazis' main purpose in this campaign is to prepare the moral basis for re-armament. Properly speaking, this is already done. For the past year maps like the one I have here, showing all Europe in arms, ranged against a defenceless Germany, have hung in schools, in newspaper offices, in empty show-windows. There is one showing how the aeroplanes of Germany's neighbors menace her, another showing all the cannons of Europe pointed at her. Of course Germany is shown to have none of these.

I have here a poster which I brought from Berlin, showing the French airfleet darkening the sky over Berlin; the city is red with flames. I witnessed a realistic and terrifying demonstration to a large crowd at an Exposition, of the effects of modern incendiary and gas bombs. Is it any wonder that Germans back the Government's re-armament, demanding that they, too, must have "security"?

For any difficulty which the Nazi leaders have in their commercial relations or foreign policy, the same simple formula of a "whole world against us" is used. In no field has it been more used than in foreign trade. The Jewish boycott, the growing difficulties in penetrating foreign markets, the clearing arrangements used to make Schacht pay his commercial debts, the falling gold reserve—each and all I have seen laid to the "ring of enemies which would deny us a chance to live." Most particularly the raw material shortage is played us as an attempt by the world "to bring Germany to her knees."

It was after the 30th June mass execution of old Party leaders that Goebbels, the Propaganda Minister and Press Dictator, manufactured the wildest rumours and stories of the machinations of a certain unnamed foreign power. The murdered men, it was said, were about to sell Germany out to this power. I remember sitting in a third class railway compartment shortly after the terrible affair and hearing a travelling salesman enlarging on these rumours.

He was telling three women passengers that he had "heard"—and he touched his Party badge—that if Roehm and his associates had succeeded in their "revolt", that France was to have had the Ruhr, Poland was to get East Prussia, and Czecho-Slovakia a piece of Upper Silesia. The women were wide-eyed, and one said fervently: "Ah! how much we owe to the Leader. How the man sacrifices himself for his people! If we would all only sacrifice like that!"

It was later on, in August, on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of German Mobilization for the War, that the Nazi leaders had a priceless opportunity to use this propaganda. For as you have seen, according to Nazi history teaching, Germany had *no* responsibility for the World War, which was caused rather by the envy of German cleverness bringing her neighbors upon her. The German of course does not want to believe that he started the War; he would much rather accept these new stories.

This propaganda will play a very important role in domestic developments in Germany. In any predictions of the future it will be as well to take it into account. It induces the people to accept sacrifices as inevitable. It strengthens the Governments hand in their scheme to make the country self-sufficient in food supplies, and in as many raw materials as possible. They say: "You remember the starvation of the last war? Well, we are going to prevent that happening again, at all costs."

The German people is a wonderfully patient people—almost irritatingly so sometimes—but it is scarce to be thought that they will bear forever the sacrifice in living standards which the Nazi self-sufficiency, war-preparation program will entail. This Nazi policy is ruining Germany's export; why! there are even Nazis in the highest posts who say that Germany doesn't want any export. The facts speak otherwise. Seventy-five years ago here was an agricultural population in Germany of 22 millions; it supported a city population of 15 millions. Today Germany has the same farm population of 22 millions, and apparently has not room for appreciably more, and the urban population has grown to 43 millions. These extra millions were justified, and supported, by a growing industrial life, and an increasing export trade. Without it Germany cannot buy the essential products which she lacks; there will be substitutes, and privation.

How much will they suffer? Can National Socialism come through the winter? They have perhaps seven-eighths of the food they had a year ago; they are perfectly organized, better now than they were in the war-time. Already grain and dairy produce is under full government control. These people are clever and courageous and will suffer. We don't know how far, but a long long way. The German, despite his technical progress and scientific leadership, has remained politically away back.

When will the break come? This year they have three-quarters of the necessary supplies, next year supposing they have eleven-sixteenths, and a month or so after something less; it is not easy to say just if or when a collapse would come. Hitler still has a great personal following—in spite of the 30th of June—who believe in the myth that he is a great, honest German. "He wants to do all he can, but he can not do everything alone," they say. He still has this large following among the people, but he has destroyed his own personal following of Storm Troops through the 30th June. That was a very significant event.

It is my belief that Hitlerism will not last through 1935 in its present form and under its present leaders. There are several strong forces in Germany today, jockeying for power. In place of the Storm Troops Hitler still has his Labour Service, most National Socialist of all forces in the country. There is the Army, three times as strong as it was a year ago. Army sentinels now guard Hitler's palace, not Storm Troopers. In all his speeches now, Hitler turns and refers to the Army. He does not exactly say: "With your permission I should like to say this," but the Army, if they are not running the show, are at least being consulted every day. (Now, this Army is much more of a force to hold Germany from falling into chaos, than it is a threat to the Peace of Europe at present.) Gradually Hitler and the Army will be ruling together. First Hitler may tell the Army what to do, then after a while perhaps, the Army will tell Hitler what to do.

There is, too, always the possibility that Hitler may be removed by death. An attempt on his life was said to have taken place a week before I left.

If Hitler is removed, is it possible that the Army—which has no General of outstanding character which it could put in the Chancellor's chair—could recall Bruening, and raise up a moderate Germany again? Is it possible out of all this emotion, defiance, excitement and hatred to set up a new moderate Germany? Or will the turmoil go further in Europe?

Perhaps a German sort of Communism, such as Nazism once promised to be, will come out of this. It is very hard to predict.

However I am convinced that in the end the natural strength and ability of the German people will bring them to a better place. I have a great sympathy for the little German man, and would like to enlist yours, too, for him, if not for his Nazi leaders. Thank you. (Applause.)

LEADERSHIP

AN ADDRESS BY THE MOST REVEREND DERWYN T. OWEN, D.D., ARCHBISHOP OF TORONTO AND PRIMATE OF ALL CANADA.

Thursday, October 11, 1934

The Guest Speaker, His Grace, Archbishop Owen, was introduced by the President of The Empire Club of Canada, Mr. Dana Porter.

PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, Your Grace and Members of The Empire Club: It is a very great compliment indeed to the Empire Club of Canada that Archbishop Owen has consented to address us on an occasion so very soon after his election to the Primacy of all Canada.

On behalf of the Club, I wish to take this opportunity of congratulating our guest of honour on his appointment. (Applause.) I am sure that we, in Toronto, do not regard this choice in any way as a surprise; indeed, quite the contrary, because, knowing Archbishop Owen as we have during the time he has spent in this city as Bishop of Toronto and as those who knew him in the days when he was Curate of St. James and Rector of Holy Trinity, all feel, I am sure, that the choice was one that was obviously right—that he was the inevitable choice.

Archbishop Owen represents that tolerance of view in matters of religion which seems to be the spirit of the times, whereas the disputatious dogma of the days gone by has rather given way to the recognition, the general recognition that although denominations may differ in the forms of their expression of worship, nevertheless there is a oneness of purpose which is recognized now by all. Archbishop Owen represents this very great tolerance of view, deep human sympathy, and, above all, an unobtrusive humility—such, indeed, that even those who have been most remote from the immediate sphere of his activities have been touched by the sense of his unforgettable presence.

It is a very great privilege, indeed, to be able to introduce to you, Archbishop Owen, Archbishop of Toronto and Primate of all Canada, as your guest of honour today. (Applause.)

ARCHBISHOP OWEN: Mr. President and Gentlemen of The Empire Club: It is natural and right that the very first thing I should do as I begin to speak to you is to acknowledge your very kindly introduction of me, Sir. I have been introduced to different audiences in the last two weeks, quite frequently and I have listened to descriptions of myself which sometimes dumfounded me. I felt entirely detached from the situation for while one part of my mind had to accept the fact that the speaker was referring to me, there was another part—a far more rational part—which knew very well he was referring to someone else. Your introduction however, ran a little closer to reality. It was very kind of you to speak as you did and I appreciate indeed the references that you have made. I can only hope that in the years to come I may be proved worthy of some of the kind things that have been said about me of late.

The subject which I wanted to speak about in the few minutes that we have at our disposal for the address after luncheon, is the general subject of "Leadership". Leadership leaves one lots of room to stray hither and yon, as you can readily understand. I want to speak of it rather as the qualifications for leadership. First of all, there is the need for leadership. That goes almost without saying. In the midst of the difficulties and the problems by which we are surrounded and of which we read day after day in the newspapers, we are so well aware that we need under God, the leadership of the best possible men in every department of life.

I know, in speaking to a Club like The Empire Club which has been founded now for more than thirty years—for thirty-one years, I think—there has been found a place for the making of leaders, and that you, to whom I am speaking, have the responsibility of leadership in certain departments of life. Some of you have that responsibility in very large departments of life. You have that put upon you which requires daily from you, courage and patience and endurance and far-sightedness and a sense of humour, but whether you have a large department under your leadership or whether it be small, I want to speak to you as brothers together in this great task of trying to lead.

I think one of the very first things so necessary in face of the difficulties and the tangles and the problems that confront those who are called upon to lead is a very simple thing and an absolutely essential thing. I was down in a certain place in the Maritime Provinces, having a conference with a group of people, not long ago. We were discussing the affairs of a certain institution and this group of people were quite frank in what they thought was the matter with that particular institution. One said that this was the matter and another that. Each one made some sort of contribution to the discussion. After the meeting a young girl came up and looked at me—she was a very intelligent girl—and said, "Do you know what is really the matter with us here?" They had been talking about all kinds of things. "The matter", she said, "is that we don't care. That is what is the matter." Whatever else a leader is, he has to be a man who really cares about the problems of the day and the burdens the people have to carry and all the difficulties by which they are surrounded.

And I want to make a reference at this particular point to that which is to take place in this city next week in which I am very much interested and in which I feel most of you are intensely interested; that is, the matter of the drive for the Federation of Community Service. That is something we all must take an interest in. I am not going to speak on the drive but I want to make a reference to it. The thirty-seven social service organizations bear the most thorough-going investigation. I believe and I speak as a churchman, as a man who speaks on behalf of the Church, I believe we are under a great debt of gratitude in the political and the social sphere to those organizations that have been working in our midst, so patiently and so faithfully. No one knows what a contribution they have made to the peace and the well being of the community. I bear my tribute to the courage and the steadfastness of the multitudes of our people, the vast majority of our people who, in these times of great stress and hardship have exercised such patience. One of the reasons, I am sure, has been the quiet, unostentatious work carried on by the various social welfares.

Now, I can see two reasons why the Community Federation drive should not be supported. I can only see two excuses for not supporting it; others may think of others. Either we don't support it because we do not know what is being done or because we don't care. As I say, I can not think of any other reason—either we don't know or we don't care.

But to come back to my subject: All leaders have got to care and care intensely, to really allow the situation which confronts him as a leader to come close to his heart.

Now I, want to pass on to speak of other requirements of leadership. The one that occurs to me is a very old-fashioned thing; that is, the old way of doing what you are told. I haven't learned very well the duties of leadership yet. I am gradually learning through the ordinary processes of experience. One thing which I do know teaches one how to lead is to learn how to obey, to learn self-control, to get control of one's own mind and not give way to impatience and—this is very important, I think—not to get embittered. Sometimes you have great ideals and you see what ought to be done and you go to work with all the enthusiasm of youth or the new leader and you find the things you thought ought to be done cannot, for the moment be done. It is just this particular point that some people are broken. They cannot stand the strain of that disillusionment. I have found in my life that the leaders who have helped me and who have given me strength have been men, who when they found that they couldn't do what they would, have been content to do what they could. (Applause.)

Another important thing in that realm is the matter of patience which is all hinged on an even temper. You know men and so do I, who have real gifts for leadership—greater gifts than many who are in positions of leadership—but they just fall short in that they cannot keep their temper when things go against them, when things do not work out as they expect them to work out, and it is that kind of temper which is so important for us who are trying in our own way and particular spheres to exercise the gift of leadership.

There is a certain writer of whose writings I am very fond, who has a word to say about this quality, one of the essential qualities of leadership. He doesn't mention it in that connection but I bring it in in that connection. He says: "I mean, not temper, as we call it, shown in the intercourse of society, nor temper shown in argument, I mean the permanent and recurring impatience and irritation sometimes produced in the mind, by a state of facts which continually cuts across our wishes, jars with our tastes, upsets our theories, or baffles our practical efforts; which seems to us wrong or absurd, but which we cannot alter; which mocks and defies our reason, or our sense of right, or our good feeling, but also defies our strength."

Who does not know of such situations? Who does not know of the irritation and the impatience that takes possession of one's heart in a situation like that? So absurd, so almost ludicrous! So paradoxical, so hopeless!

And yet, it is just in the face of that situation that a man is being tested for real leadership. If he can maintain his poise, if he can renew his strength and go on in the face of those paradoxical situations, he may be found worthy to lead.

Those qualities that I am speaking of are more or less on the negative side; you will say, and very rightly, "But surely a leader has to have originality. He has to be the man who will take risks, not merely the man who will endure and take control of himself, and keep on trying, and when one thing fails try another." You have to have people strike out for themselves and take a chance. That is quite true. We have to have the spirit of originality and be ourselves and stress our own originality and go on a great adventure and we have to take chances and run risks. You have to combine those two things together always.

If I were trying to paint a picture of a person I thought could really lead, it would be a man who has had his head in the clouds but his feet right squarely on the ground. He would have to be a man who had real vision and yet be very practical. There are people like that, who have a great capacity for seeing long distances and viewing the great horizons, who at the same time are very practical about the ordinary details of life. A leader has to be a man who says, "You set me to make bricks but without straw. I will make bricks without straw. I would rather have the straw but I have found in my life and in my reading that some of the finest edifices erected in history have been made of bricks erected without straw." The people who do things apparently impossible to do are people with that wonderful combination of the vision and the practical. You ask the pioneer—my old friend, the pioneer. As he stands in the door of his shack in the forest of Upper Canada, if he were asked what he saw from that door—and from a great number you would get the reply that he saw a wonderful community about to grow out of the swamp and morass and dark forest of Upper Canada. He would say, "I see far greater communities and cities growing up here. I see wonderful roads instead of a corduroy road. I see a place for my children and my children's children, far greater than that." Yet, that was the same man who went on toiling, dragging out the stumps, doing the ordinary everyday things, year after year. It was the pioneer spirit of which I was trying to speak in the Club a year and a half ago, the pioneer spirit we need in all our leaders, the combination of vision and ordinary hard work.

We have to dream dreams. It is a good thing to dream dreams in these days of hard practical realities and we must not stop dreaming dreams. As a friend of mine said in a letter a little while ago, "The best thing you can do after you have been dreaming dreams is to wake up and after you wake up, you had better go to work." I think that is a very good illustration. Those are the things most important in a leader's work. Dream dreams? O, yes, otherwise your work won't be much use. Don't stop dreaming dreams but wake up and go to work.

There is another thing about a leader. It is very important that you and I who are trying to lead in our different departments of life, it is very important that we should be a little ahead of the group we are trying to lead. It is our business to see a little further, to be a little bit ahead, but we must not be too far ahead because if we are too far ahead we lose touch and we cannot hear what they are saying and it is very important to hear what they are saying. Don't misunderstand me about this—we must be in touch with the crowd, with the group we are trying to lead. Therefore, I would suggest those two things as being very important.

You know sometimes I get some advice handed me. So do you. It takes a good deal of understanding to take advice right. Sometimes the advice I get is excellent advice; it is just exactly what I thought myself.

Sometimes I get better advice than that and I get advice which shows me that what I thought myself was wrong. But the kind of advice I have no use for—and I think all of us in certain positions get this kind of advice—how can I put it? He comes to me and tells me what I should do were the conditions ideal, if everything was all right. He assumes that the conditions are all ideal and then tells you what to do. That kind of advice is no good to me. I know pretty well what to do if the conditions are ideal. What I want to know is what to do with the conditions far from ideal and what am I going to do with things as they are, the situation being what it is.

Therefore, I think it is most important that we, having these positions, should not assume any kind of doctrinaire attitude towards life. We should be very practical, dream our dreams, but stay wide awake. Have our head in the clouds and our feet on the ground.

Now, I have one more thing to say and I think it is the most important thing about the leader. We must have a profound belief in something that is very hard to say in a few words. We must have a profound belief in the fact that goodness, order, beauty, are stronger than badness and chaos and ugliness and that those things must win. (Applause). You know, I think one of our troubles is a kind of question mark right there. That is one of the problems of leadership. Yes, people say—they don't say it in words, but you can hear almost singing through the atmosphere, not singing but groaning through the atmosphere—just a kind of question: I wonder if life has any meaning? Is there any guarantee that hard work and sacrifice and beauty are really worth while? Any one with a sensitive mind senses that question and I think it is a good thing for leaders to face that question very squarely. You know what it is—the question of God. Who can lead in these days and who can lead but those who believe that there is a unifying purpose running through life which is on the side of order, goodness and truth, and that that is the strongest thing in life? It is that which we call God.

I have in my hand two stanzas of a poem of which I am fond and with which I wanted to close these few words about leadership. They were written a good many years ago by a son, concerning his father. When Mathew Arnold went back to Rugby Chapel, some few years after his father's death, he wrote a poem called "Rugby Chapel," about his father, the great Dr. Arnold of Rugby. It is about as good a description of a leader such as we should like to be—and let us try to be—as any I know. This is the picture and remember, this was written eighty years ago, nearly, but it might have been written in the year 1934 instead of in 1857. It might have been written in Canada:

"See! In the rocks of the world
Marches the host of mankind,
A feeble, wavering line.
Where are they tending?—a God
Marshalled them, gave them their goal.
Ah, but the way is so long!
Years they have been in the wild!
Sore thirst plagues them, the rocks,
Rising all round, overawe;
Factions divide them, their host
Threatens to break, to dissolve.
—Ah, keep, keep them combined!
Else, of the myriads who fill
That army, not one shall arrive;
Sole they shall stray; in the rocks
Stagger forever in vain;
Die one by one in the waste."

And here is the leadership. Here comes Dr. Arnold in the situation—in my department, **in yours:**

Then in such hour of need
Of your fainting, dispirited race
Ye, like angels, appear,

Radiant with ardor divine!
Beacons of hope, ye appear!
Languor is not in your heart,
Weakness is not in your word,
Weariness not on your brow.
Ye alight in our van! At your voice,
Panic, despair, flee away.
Ye move through the ranks, recall
The stragglers, refresh the outworn,
Praise, re-inspire the brave!
Order, Courage, return,
Eyes rekindling, and prayers,
Follow your steps as ye go.
Ye fill up the gaps in our files,
Strengthen the wavering line,
Stablish, continue our march,
On, to the bound of the waste,
On, to the City of God."

And the leader must believe in a City and in God and the worthwhileness of sacrifice and work and ideals. (Hearty Applause).

THE POLITICAL FUTURE IN ENGLAND

AN ADDRESS BY THE MOST HONOURABLE THE MARQUESS OF LOTHIAN, C.H.

October 18, 1934.

The guest speaker, Lord Lothian, was introduced by the President of The Empire Club, Mr. Dana Porter.

MR. PORTER: At one time an historian who was rather fond of making epigrams rather flippantly said that politics is a second rate business for second rate men. He did not take into account the political careers if such as Philip Kerr, the Marquess of Lothian. The notable part that has been played in the political life of Great Britain by our guest of honour today has always been marked by the application of a first class mind to what he has at all times seriously regarded as a first class business. In this country our recollection of the part played by our guest of honour during the Great War when he was Secretary to the then Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, is still very fresh. During those days he made himself indispensable through his tact, sound judgment and capacity for dispassionate, critical analysis. Seldom have two men been so closely associated and at the same time have worked so harmoniously and effectively for a common purpose as the then Prime Minister of Great Britain and our guest of honour today, both at the same time possessing qualities of supreme brilliance, yet very widely different in character.

We read in Lord Riddell's War Diary, where the name of Phillip Kerr persistently recurs, of a discussion of a certain Welsh poem which the then Prime Minister appears to have written, about twenty years previously, and Lloyd George is quoted as saying: "Kerr asked me to explain it. You can't explain poetry, but I said to him that it described the splitting of clouds or something of that sort, to which Kerr objected, 'But you cannot split clouds'. I ultimately gave up the attempt."

I have great pleasure in introducing to you today, The Marquess of Lothian. (Applause).

LORD LOTHIAN: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I rather wonder how the historian mentioned by your Chairman today would have described politicians if they belonged to the House of Lords because, while it has the distinction of antiquity in the great part of England today, its duty is not to contain anybody who is, in any true sense of the word, a good politician. You will be glad to know that Mr. Lloyd George has never expressed a high opinion of that ancient institution to which I have the honour to belong. Whether I could work with such close association with him, since, through no act of my own I changed my name, I am not so clear. I never heard during the whole period of my association with him, any epithet of a eulogistic or enthusiastic character applied to the House of Lords.

Now, Gentlemen, I venture to think that perhaps because I have been associated for a long time with Mr. Lloyd George and, therefore, may be said to have had some capacity for appreciating political situations that you might like to hear an estimate of the political situation, the economic situation in the Old Country today, (Applause) because we may be confronted with very difficult and dangerous situations and I think it is a matter, not only of interest to ourselves but of interest to Canada, as to whether Great Britain is reasonably well-equipped to weather the storms which lie ahead.

I was asked repeatedly in the United States from which I have just come for the explanation of the British recovery, and I think it may be roughly based on the following three factors: In the first place, the return to power at the election of 1931 of a National Government which created in Great Britain the sense that the period of minority government had come to an end and minority governments are essentially unstable; and that you had a government composed of representatives of all three parties which had resolution, strength and above all, stability, and therefore people could plan their business programmes with the assurance that there was going to remain in power for a number of years a strong and stable government. The second element was the vigour and the success with which that government balanced budget. It was confronted when it came into power, as some of you may remember, with a probable deficit of about £200,000,000, on a total budget of about £800,000,000—a 25 per cent deficit. In the first year it cut from expenditures, about $80,000,000 and added taxation of £120,000,000, with the result that the budget has been kept balanced and the last budget even began to make some return of its cuts on wages and salaries and some reduction of the income tax.

It may surprise you that I, as a life-long Liberal in England, am not quite certain that a Liberal in England is exactly the same as a Liberal in Canada, but as a life-long English Liberal, you may be surprised to hear me say that the third factor in our recovery has been Protection. I am going to say something nasty about protection later on. There is no doubt that protection, especially in our present age, does bring what I might call short dated advantages to the country which puts it on. It transferred to within its own borders manufacture of articles which it previously obtained from abroad. The disadvantages of protection are the shipping on foreign investments and the dislocating of the world balance between supply and demand, which do not show themselves quite as quickly. Protection has undoubtedly led to the bringing into Great Britain of a number of industries, smaller industries manufacturing specialty products which were previously imported from outside.

The result of these three factors, stable government, a balanced budget and protection, has been the reduction of unemployment in Great Britain by about 700,000 men and women, a recovery of business, considerable expansion of what may be called capital industry, so obviously absent from the United States, and a surprisingly small reduction—and for the last month or two, no reduction—in our export trade.

On the other hand, there is no use disguising from ourselves the fact that the problem is not solved. We have still got 2,000,000 unemployed and taking five per family or four to a family, 2,000,000 unemployed is a very formidable element in a population of 45,000,000. I think there is no doubt that the recovery is slowing up. Mr. Runciman, probably the best authority, said in Parliament in July that the curve of recovery was flattening out. If you read the statistics you will find that we are importing so little of a manufactured character from abroad that there cannot be much more to be obtained from the protective tariff in the transferring of industries to Great Britain. I think it is true that the period of recovery is slackening off and my own view is that Great Britain and almost all other nations will discover that full recovery is only possible when the nations begin to recognize and put that recognition into practice, that they must seriously set to work to restore international trade. (Applause).

Before going on to discuss that aspect of the question, may I return for a moment to the British position? We must have another election in England some time before October, two years hence and as it is unusual in England for any government or party to go to the supreme limit of its time, it generally being regarded as a sign of lack of confidence, the probability is that there will be a general election in Great Britain some time, not this winter but next winter, in the autumn, winter or spring of 1935 or 1936, because on the whole it is our habit not to have the election in the height of the summer or in the middle of the holiday season.

Now prophecying with regard to politics is proverbially dangerous, but it is an occupation peculiarly interesting to politicians and I am going to make a mild prophecy after giving an analysis of some of the problems of a political character in Great Britain today.

The present House of Commons has 715 representatives, falling into two groups. There are about 540 members and the Opposition—the Labour Party and that section of the Liberal Party to which I have the honour to belong which withdrew from the Government after certain nefarious practices had been conducted at Ottawa three years ago. The balance of the House consists of the supporters of the National Government of whom no less than 460 or 470 are members of the Conservative Party, the balance being National Liberals or National Socialists or Labour—followers of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald.

As is always the case when you have a swollen majority, the principle opposition comes not from the Opposition but from dissension within its own ranks and that has shown itself very clearly in the vehement opposition which has grown up and is extending in the Conservative ranks to the Indian policy of the Government.

Now, I am going to venture to give you a brief analysis of the Indian problem because it is going to break into controversy with extreme vehemence on or about November 20th of this year when the Joint Select Committee Report on the White Paper on which the Government proposals are made will be published and the death struggle will begin between the "Die Hards," as I call them, led by Winston Churchill and the Government, in effect led by Stanley Baldwin, as to whether the proposals of the Select Committee should or should not be enacted into law.

Here are the elements of the Indian problem: India contains 350,000,000 people. It is divided into major areas—British India where a bureaucratic government run by the Indian Civil Service which is in effect a British Service tempered by the legislation which was brought into being in 1920, and which has some direct responsibility for the government but which hasn't a limited responsibility in the provinces. Three-quarters of India is known as British India; the other quarter is governed by 125 hereditary monarchs, none of which have representative institutions in the responsible sense of the word. India speaks about twelve main languages. It contains universities which are turning out university trained students at the rate of about 100,000 in the universities at the same time. The main divisions are religious—between Mahommedan Hindus whose relations to one another are not unlike those which existed in Europe at the time of the Reformation when Europe split between Roman Catholics and Protestants. Eight per cent of the population is literate and the population increased by no less than 31,000,000 in the last ten years.

There is an active native press—a native language press. Five-eighths of the ministers in the provinces are Indians and the Viceroy's Council of seven people contains three Indian members. India also contains a very large number of extremely able lawyers, trained in England, very largely, and the Woman's Movement has attained extraordinary dimensions in a very short space of time.

Now, the controversy in England does not relate as to whether or not there shall be a further advance to self-government; it relates to the speed and character of the advance. The "Die Hards", the Opposition, let us say, to the Government within the Conservative ranks, say in effect that the idea of trying to found an Indian Federation, more or less on the American model, containing 350,000,000 people divided as I have described, on a democratic foundation, with only eight per cent of the population literate and with the volcanic forces which undoubtedly exist in Indian politics, is to plan for certain disaster and, to refer to a well-known French expert, 'Great Britain has no right to take such chances with the fortunes of the 350,000,000 humble peasants who really have nothing to do with the government of the country and are not yet in a position to ensure stable government. The result in the transferring of full responsibility, as the Government proposes to do in the Provinces, to the Indian Legislature and partial responsibility in the centers, is to condemn India in due time—not necessarily rapidly, but eventually—to chaos worse than that to be found in China.

On the other hand, the Government takes a different view. They say, "We are committed and have been committed by Parliament itself to the problem of the steady extension of self-government."

Nationalism is the strongest political force in the modern world. It is growing rapidly in India and it is never stronger than where it is a protest against the government of one race by another race. Further, India contains great numbers of extremely able men even if you may doubt whether these are the people who will be returned to power by the ordinary democratic electoral system.

Finally, the future in India: The main positions in the Civil Service, in politics, in Journalism, in business and law will inevitably fall into the hands, already to a great extent are in the hands of students of the Indian universities and of the universities in Europe and the United States and every one of those students, as is always the case, is a frank and vehement Nationalist, demanding that India should have the right to run its own affairs and learn by its own mistakes, however disastrous those mistakes may be. Therefore, unless you go forward to the degree which will carry the consent of the moderate minded people in India, you will invitably reproduce in India on a vastly greater scale, the situation which was produced by centuries of repression in Ireland in which the most energetic and enthusiastic and patriotic element went into revolutionary and blood-thirsty opposition as being the only way of removing what they regarded as the alien tie. Therefore, while admittedly there is grave risk in going as fast as the White Paper proposes, it is dangerous to deny the expectation aroused in India and drive the whole of the youth and the intelligensia into violent, terroristic revolution which will poison the atmosphere of the country, which will poison Anglo-American relations and follow with disasters worse than that which may follow the other course.

There is the issue. It is a very grave responsibility which lies on Great Britain and the outcome will not only affect Great Britain, it will affect the world because if India, either through revolution or the breakdown of government, goes into chaos, that will be another blow and a very serious blow to the prosperity of mankind.

Now, the battle in this issue is solely and wholly within the ranks of the Conservative party. The Labour party, on the whole, is in favour of going faster than the White Paper. The Liberal Party supports the White Paper; the majority of the Conservatives, certainly in the House of Commans, support it, or have done so in the past. But there is a vehement, conscientious, formidable, resolute minority of the Conservative party which is convinced that it is its duty to resist this plan even to the point of disrupting the Conservative party itself. Nobody can tell you what its numbers are. Hitherto, it has succeeded in the party conferences, which is by no means always an accurate test—in fact is seldom an accurate test of the real feeling of the party—in obtaining about one-third of the votes. Last week at a Conservative party conference, it managed to secure practically half of the votes. What the exact significance of that change is, I do not know. Until you can see somebody who was present at the meeting, who can tell the local circumstances, you cannot tell. On the face, it looks as though the opposition is strengthened.

Now, Mr. Baldwin, for whom I have a great admiration, is confronted by, I think, the fight of his life over this issue. Mr. Baldwin has this faith—I do not say I have—that the Conservative party is the most important political force in England, that the Conservative party goes to disaster unless it is kept liberal and progressive in its general outlook and there is going to be a battle. This winter you will see it resounding from one end of England to the other. You will see it reported night after night in the reports of the House of Commons, between the "Die Hards," as I call them, led by Mr. Winston Churchill and Lloyd George, either to emasculate the bill or to abandon it, and prevent the transference of the responsibility to Indian hands, and the Government forces which will try and carry a majority in the House of Commons and also the House of Lords in order to enact that Constitution and put it on the statute books by July of next year.

You will also see great controversy in India because, on the whole the Indian politicians will say that the Constitution does not go far enough and by noisy agitation they will hope to get it liberalized still further.

I do not think myself that the "Die Hards" will succeed in disrupting the National Government. I believe that the National Government will succeed in putting the White Paper on the statute books, as recommended by the Joint Select Committee Report and I think after that battle is fought and, I hope, won, it will formulate a five year programme for domestic affairs and will go to the country asking for a verdict some time between October and April of 1935 and 1936.

Now, that is my prophecy but, as is always the case in politics, it is liable to be very much upset by events.

Now, for the Labour Party: The Labour Party since its crushing defeat has been divided between the left wing, the ardent and extreme Socialists, whose most notable figure is Sir Stafford Cripps, and the more experienced Labour politicians and the leaders of the Trade

Unions who, in effect, create the organization upon which the Labour Party rests and who supply most of the funds with which it can fight elections. The first result of the defeat of 1931 was that the intellectuals in the Labour Party tried to lead the whole Labour Party into a programme of almost revolutionary Socialism to include the nationalism of banks, lands, textiles, coal, transportation, and something else, within the lifetime of a single parliament. That battle has, as the election becomes nearer, ended in the victory of the more moderate trade union wing of the party which is still describing those ends as the ultimate objective but have decided to take quite moderate steps in that direction in the next Parliament and do not even commit themselves to abolish the House of Lords. So the moderate forces in England are asserting themselves on the left side while the more extreme forces, if I may so describe the "Die Hards," are fighting their battle with vigour on the right.

I am not going to spend much time—hardly any time—in describing the prospects and future of the Liberal Party because it suffers from two difficulties: First, is that two-thirds of the Conservative Party, and now two-thirds of the Labour Party, are in effect, Liberals with a small "L". The Liberal programme of the Victorian age — Woman's Suffrage, Social Reform, Democracy, Self-Determination, is the accepted programme of a great majority of both the other parties. And the other difficulty—speaking as one politician to other politicians—is that elections, especially general elections, cost an infernal lot of money, and property finances the Conservative Party and trade unionism, on the whole, finances the Labour Party, and we still have to find the great leaders and captains of industry who will finance to the same degree the party to which I have the honour to belong. If that problem is realized, that is a fair diagnosis. My own view is that the National Government which, in effect, will be the Conservative Party, will win the next election, eighteen months hence, with a greatly reduced majority, but still an adequate working majority which will get 360 or 370 of the seats. The Labour Party will come back greatly strengthened but with no majority and still a good way from a majority. I won't predict how many Liberals will be returned.

So, looking at the picture as a whole, especially in relation to the extraordinary confused and dangerous state of the world, I do not think it is altogether unsatisfactory. I am more confident of the future of Great Britain today than I was five years ago. (Applause) We were pretty badly strained by the Great War and after the Great War there was a lot of wild thinking and reckless habits, political and otherwise, which found echoes in Great Britain. I think we have recovered what the Americans call our poise and there is a great deal of vigorous thinking going on on all sides—Conservative, Liberal and Labour—which is animated by a very high public spirit and a willingness to face facts as they are and deal with things on the basis of fact. I think we shall see our way through though there are very great difficulties ahead, economic and political, especially in India, and also international. At any rate, I feel a quiet optimism about *my* country, at any rate. (Applause).

I said a few minutes ago that I thought that no nation would get rid of its unemployed and return to full prosperity until enough nations realized that they had to make a resolute effort to restore international trade. I am trying to think that in another year's time, if the United States has come out of its tailspin—which I confess, after being there, is a considerable "IF"—that you will see a more considered and determined effort to reverse the extreme economic nationalism of the last three or four or five years which has been the root cause of the failure of Democracy in so many countries in the world.

I am now going to inflict on you for a few minutes, my criticism of protection, having admitted its advantages to Great Britain for the last three years. The more I think of it and the more my colleagues and friends think of it, the more do we become convinced that the basic principle upon which the prosperity of the world rested during the last century, which saw the greatest rise in the standard of living ever known in human history, were essentially sound, and it will not be possible to depart in any serious degree from them. Now the basis of the economic problem, as I see it—this is simply an individual view—is how in an age of constant invention, constant new enterprise, constant introduction of labour saving devices, all of which enable the individual to buy more for his dollar, how are you going to keep capital and labour making those things or those fragments of things which are, in the sum total, actually exchangeable against one another? That is the root problem and in theory there are only two ways of doing it. One is Communism, which is the only form of Socialism which will work and Communism says the state will determine first, what everybody shall consume. It will give you eggs on Monday, hash on Tuesday, fish on Wednesday. It decides that it will prohibit any kind of private economic enterprise and, having thus decided what is to be consumed, it can then plan distribution and production. If it allows any form of private enterprise, as the N.E.P. proved in Russia, its planning goes to pieces. If you don't go into Communism, the only alternative in a world in which you allow private property, private economic initiative and consumer's choice, is to allow competition and price in the market to determine what it shall produce and where capital and labour are to go, for it means, inevitably, in a progressive society, the constant destruction of all capital, the constant provision of new capital and the perpetual movement of labour from one kind of occupation to another. During the last century, competition and price kept supply and demand in very fair equilibrium, despite the introduction of the factory system, despite the discovery of railways and electricity. It can do so still, despite all mass production if the system itself is allowed to function, but that does not mean that there is no room for what we, in England, used to call Social Reform, but competition inevitably involves suffering and distress and anxiety for the employee and in the great Liberal Parliament of 1906, whose works have been one of the principle reasons why we have come through the depression with so little social trouble at home, said, in effect, that the community should temper the wind of competition to the shorn lamb of labour, that it must provide for the three major anxieties of the employee—what is to happen to him in his old age wen he can no longer get a job; what is to happen when he is thrown out of a job through no fault of his own, and has to take time and money to find a new job; and what is to happen in case of sickness if his resources are not adequate to enable him to pay the doctor and the hospital bills. The system of Old Age Pensions, insurance against unemployment and insurance against sickness have done a great deal to mitigate those hardships though what you can do is obviously dependent and limited by your national wealth at any one time.

In addition, we adopted the principle that the greater inequalities of wealth were socially undesirable, and by graduated income taxation and death duties—which I, personally, think are high—we have done something to mitigate and prevent from generation to generation the great social inequalities. There is no doubt that there is room for state intervention to protect the employee in various other ways and increase the amount of the social life of the community. It is all designed to allow the competitative system to function without interference, to leave the competitive system to function but to add to it Social Reform.

Once you begin to put on excessive tariffs, embargoes, exchange systems, when you adopt what I think is the fatal system of protection to prevent the competitive system moving capital and labour internationally, the moderate level of protection of which they say, "Put it on; it can do no harm and will do a great deal of good." once you begin to think you can found prosperity on unlimited public work, on unlimited borrowing of public money and spending it, you get in a tailspin such as the United States is in today and I believe these basic laws, these basic principles which served the world with incomparable success in the last century, and which, with all the minor defects it is easy to record, raised the standard of living to an extraordinary degree, when it had stayed stable for a century before. It transported millions of people across this country and gave the highest standard of living ever known, and the basic principles are such that if you add to them an immense amount of Social Reform, you must not interfere with the basic principles themselves. When mankind comes to a realization that the basic principles must be obeyed, when they cease to think that our difficulties can be solved by economic nationalism, when they cease to think you can work yourselves to prosperity, Democracy will again begin to spread and the whole theory of the League of Nations will be recovered and we may enter an era of peace and prosperity which seems quite out of reach today. (Applause).

PRESIDENT PORTER: On behalf of The Empire Club, I wish to thank you, Sir, for your most concise and comprehensive survey of the situation in Great Britain. I am sure we shall all watch events unfold themselves in fulfillment of your prophecy. (Applause).

A PERSONAL CONFESSION OF FAITH

AN ADDRESS BY MISS VERA BRITTAIN.

October 30, 1934.

The guest of honour, Miss Vera Brittain, was introduced by the President of The Empire Club, Mr. Dana Porter.

MR. DANA PORTER: Miss Brittain and Gentlemen: If Adam and Eve had survived long enough to read Milton's "Paradise Lost", it might have been that they would, perhaps, not agree with some of the accounts of what took place in the garden, as described by the poet and they would perhaps not, most certainly not, agree with his description of the standard of living in the Garden of Eden.

I may say that I am not making this reference as casting any reflection in any way on "Youth's Morals, Today and Yesterday", but those people who actually lived through the events that were recorded will be the one's to be most critical, the ones who would be most quick to pick holes in the various details recorded and perhaps they would be slowest to realize the main purpose of the work. Therefore, it seems to me, that in spite of the unanimous acclaim which has been received by Miss Brittain's "Testament of Youth", by what she describes as the war generation, nevertheless it seems to me that that book will be most appreciated by the generation which is, perhaps, better known as the post-war generation and the book will live because it speaks in their own language, the language of those of us who are of the post-war generation. In reading that book, we read a great and classic tragedy, a tragedy which concerns the most intimate details of a most interesting personality, as affected by the pressure of world events. As the events unfold themselves, the relentless sequence reminds us of the tragedies of the Greeks, but what impresses us the most is the magnificent comeback after the war, when a new life seems to be created and new interests are aroused and it is Miss Brittain's faith that she proposes to speak to us about today. I have very great pleasure in calling on Miss Brittain. (Applause).

MISS VERA BRITTAIN: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen: Whenever I am asked to speak about my "Testament of Youth", and the philosophy of life that lies behind it, I am reminded of a story that I heard not long ago about a young American sculptor who was exhibiting a large group of symbolic statuary at an exhibit of sculpture. The statue was enormous and rather mystifying and somebody at the exhibit came up to him and said, "I admire your work very much, Mr. Brown, but I should be so glad if you would explain to me a little bit of what it is intended to represent and he replied, a little unhappily, "Well, to tell you the truth, I don't rightly know. It started as salt cellars but it has gotten away from me."

Well, I feel a little like that about my "Testament of Youth." It started in a very humble fashion, and I feel the fact that it has landed me on this lecture tour, among other things, with so many delightful visits to countries with which I had comparatively little acquaintance, and then that it has been so kindly received in England where it is very difficult to move anybody to be excited about anything, is all rather evidence of the fact that something or other in it has gotten away from me and I feel that I am the very humble originator of something that has rather gotten out of my own control.

I hope that this speech won't get out of my own control because it is always a little difficult to talk in an impersonal way about one's own work and one's own views.

I think I should begin for the benefit of, I am sure, the majority of you who haven't read my book, by giving just a brief summary of what it is all about before I begin to talk about it.

"Testament of Youth" is not a novel. I think I ought to begin by saying that, partly because I have been told by so many people that the appearance I give of having nothing in my head has made people say that it cannot possibly be true that I really went through those horrors—that if I had done so they would have left more marks on me than they have done. I cannot do anything about it; I can only constantly assert that "Testament of Youth" is autobiography. However unconvincing it may seem, it is my own story, or the story of four young people, four boys and a girl, upon whom the impact of war fell just as they were leaving school and going up to college. The book begins with quite a trivial account of the girl's war against provincial young ladyhood, in order to show the type of life that got caught up in the war and that had its ambitions and ideals and all its attitude to life changed by being taken up, as it were, by a great world event and used for purposes of which it had never dreamed.

So, we being with that account of life in a small English provincial town and the attitude of a rebellious young woman toward her unfortunate parents and her endeavours to get away from the cramping limitations of the society in which she lived. But very soon the war breaks out and we find that little group involved in it. First of all the boys all go in the early weeks of the war. Three of them serve on the Western Front, the fourth one serves both on the Western Front and in Italy. None of them come back from the War. In the case of the girl, myself, she starts by going to Oxford, but very soon finds the life intolerable with still more important things going on and she becomes a Red Cross nurse and serves in London and in the Mediterranean and on the Western Front and is the only one of the group to be left alive after the war was over. And she finds, on returning after Armistice Day, that everything that made up her life has disappeared with the men who went down in the war, as so many women must have found in those days, and at a comparatively early age life seemed to have been lived and to be over and the only thing that remains, if she has the energy for it, is to try and create a new life, based, perhaps, on new values and certainly involving new friendships and new human relationships.

So, the last part of that book which some people have told me is the dust but which I, personally, agree with my Chairman is the most important because construction is no less dramatic than destruction and seems to me more important to the world of the present day than even the dramatic memories of what we went through and which I hope no generation will go through again.

That is just a brief account of what this book was intended to be about and because it is a little difficult to start straight away in talking about the personal aspects of how it came to be written and the philosophy behind it, I think it is worth while just giving you a brief picture of the literary world into which a book of this kind had to fit, because I think part of the reason for the really overwhelmingly kind reception it has had on both sides of the Atlantic has nothing to do with me and nothing to do with the merits of the book, but is due as so often happens in the case of the best seller, to the time and the hour and the exigency, altogether as it were. The time had come when a book of that kind was desirable and perhaps, subconsciously had been waited for, particularly by the women of the war generation and at the moment owed to the catenation of events which had nothing to do with the author and had nothing to do with its appearance. I expect here, as with us, you had directly after the war a very strong reaction against war literature. Everybody was saying at home, "I don't want to read about the war." That was quite understandable; we did not want to read about what we had all lived through and what for a time was quite intolerable to remember. So there was the reaction against war literature for a period of seven or eight years although during that time some very eminent war books were published, such as R. H. Mottram's "Spanish Farm," which did not become best sellers and probably won more reputation for their writers since those days than at the time.

About 1927 or 1928, there came a violent reaction in favour of war books and the play, "Journey's End," had its marvellous reception and progress through the British Empire and through non-English speaking countries as well. Robert Graves "Goodbye To All That" and Richard Addington's, "Death of a Hero," found a large number of readers and for a time everybody was reading books about the war.

Then, very naturally, there came a reaction against that. People said, "I am tired of these war books; I don't want to read any more about war."

It had just happened that none of these books were by women. I don't know whether that fact was particularly present in my mind. I never especially thought of it in my mind as a war book; I thought of it as a book about my generation. It was a fact that by 1929, with the exception of an American woman, Mary Lee who wrote a large and decidedly wicked book called, "It's a Great War"—of course, beginning only in 1917, with America's part in the war; that wasn't her fault, she didn't experience the war before 1917 and she doesn't suggest that it didn't exist before then—there had been no books by a woman dealing with the war in a comprehensive way. It was just in this period of reaction against war that I started to do "Testament of Youth." My literary agents, with the best possible intentions, advised me not to touch a book about war if I wanted to get over to the public. At that time I was indifferent to literary agents and everybody else and I had to go, just had to go ahead and write the book for reasons I will explain a little later on. I might have suffered very badly from that reaction if it had been published then. As it happened, the events that caught up the world just in the year my book was destined to be published were of a type to turn the minds of all thinking men and women to international questions.

I think perhaps it would be worth while to give a brief sketch just to remind you of some of the events of 1933 to 1934 which have made the topics of peace and war two very important subjects of discussion. You remember that the year started—1933 I am referring to now—with Japan's adventure in Manchuria. I remember so well the evening that the Japanese went into Jehol. (I am sure that is pronounced wrong but you probably know where I mean). It was a cold February night and I was going to have dinner with the English novelist, Storm Jameson, I had to change busses at Hyde Park corner and the news of the Japanese adventure had just come through. Most of you who know Hyde Park corner can picture what it looks like on a stormy February night. You can imagine the shock I got to see the corner plastered with posters just issued with the words, REMEMBER 1914. It gave one a shock and made one realize just what that particular adventure might lead to. Fortunately, it did not, though it gave us all a great deal of anxiety for quite a long time.

Then, in March, came the trial of the four British engineers in Moscow which created quite a tension for a time between Great Britain and Russia. Then, we had in the summer, the failure—one has, I am afraid to call it that—of the World Economic Conferences. We had the dissatisfaction in many countries with the Disarmament Conference and in October last year, there came another shock to the world when Germany left the Disarmament Conference and the League of Nations. Now, all this could not help but lead to a new interest in war books. It was a different kind of interest to that of 1927 and 1928. One might almost say that the success of the war books of an earlier period was due to a desire on the part of men to get the war out of their minds by a description written by some one else, a story of life at the trenches and just what life at the trenches had meant. Most of those books owed their success, as had "Journey's End," to the very poignant and graphic details of life as lived by men during the war. But the international situation in 1933 to 1934 made people, I think, more interested in the background of wars, in the kind of situation, political, economic and social, that led to war and, also in the type of psychology that war creates in those who go through it. So there was a sort of interest in, I don't like to call it a bigger book, but the type of book that would see things in a larger perspective than, for instance, "Journey's End," which is, I suppose, an immortal picture of what actually happens to a group and through a group to all the men who took part in the war, but the whole end is psychological rather than economic; they approach more of the background than the whole picture of even what happened to a small group.

You know Frank Swinnerton—he is read here as much as at home. He has quite a revealing paragraph in his book entitled, Authors and the Book Trade," called, 'Why books become best sellers, and in mentioning the reasons he states that it is not necessarily the case that any mixture of sex and religion will have a large sale. A best seller is a book written by one whose mentality and preoccupations are those of a large number of persons. A popular best seller is a book written by a sincere author whose talent may be greater than the common palate but whose tastes are similar to the popular taste.

In those years the preoccupations of most thinking people were with questions of peace and war and so they were ready to read a book which tried to link a personal story, which tried to link up the private life of an individual with what George Eliot has called "the larger destinies of mankind" and which endeavoured to show how in this interconnected world it will henceforth be impossible to ever hope to live in the sort of disregarding isolation from the great events of the world that they were able to live in when distance and space and time had not been conquered in the way they have today. So, I think, people were ready for a book of the type of "Testament of Youth," even though it was written by a woman. I never expected that any men would read my book. I certainly did not expect that a group of men of such a distinguished Club as this would have the patience to listen to a mere woman hold forth on why she wrote her book. The explanation is just that I think that the book got away from me to the extent that large events always get away from mere individuals and it is the events rather than the person or the book in which the readers have been interested.

I have to try to tell you quite briefly, how the book came to be written and what was the philosophy that lay behind it. As I said just now, it was written because it had to be written and I suppose it is an example of what a great many men are still opposed to—the attempt to combine marriage and a career—and the fact that in certain situations this can be done, because I suppose never had any woman more interruptions to contend with than I had when I was trying to write this book. One of my children was born while I was in the process of writing it. I had also to move house as my family was growing larger. My husband became a parliamentary candidate in an election and I had to speak for him. Everybody that I had anything to do with became ill and I had to have something to do with their recovery. In fact, life was just one damned thing after another, and I suppose the fact that the book revived and got written was due to the fact that something was trying to express itself from a generation through the pen of one person and for some unknown reason. Fate elected me to be the person to make that particular type of expression.

I had known for quite a long time what I wanted to do. I wanted to show what the whole war period which had gone and after had meant not to women, as has often been said, but to my generation. I did not try to speak for men; I allowed the men to speak for themselves, as those of you who have read it know. I made a good deal of use of their letters, as I imagine many of you here who went through their experiences could write and probably did write. Probably you did not write them to somebody who had the habit of keeping letters or was bold enough to put them in a book. I claim in my introduction that I took three and a half years to write the book. Actually, I suppose, I really took about fifteen, because the germ was first in my mind when I came back from an experience that many of you have shared with me and which I cannot pretend that I went through in the way you went through it, although perhaps some of your feelings were reflected in the way I felt about it—I mean the great German Offensive of 1918 in France.

When I came back, although a very young girl, I felt that I had been rather steam-rolled through the events I had been living under. I had a great idea that something had been happening that had nothing to compare with it in the history of the world and I made a sort of record of that Offensive and my life in France in a semi-fictional form which never got publication, happening never to be submitted to any publisher without the common sense which most publishers possess. I did rescue certain parts of that contemporary record and did put them in my "Testament of Youth." When I had the book in my mind I also saw it as reflecting my own philosophy which is probably a more pacifist philosophy than many of you might be prepared to accept wholesale, but it did involve a vehement protest against war as I had seen it and it became a plea for peace, not because women, like men, are not ready to suffer but because a war of the type of the last war does remove the best people from a generation. The kind of propaganda that war propaganada is today does make its appeal to the young and the idealistic and the finest people who hear it, both the physically finest and the mentally most heroic. Therefore, in the Great War, from all the countries who took part in it, the finest people went and a very large proportion of them did not come back and today I think nobody would refuse to admit that we are feeling, deeply feeling, particularly, perhaps, in England and France and Germany, which had the onslaught of the war from the beginning, the lack of those people of the middle generation who should now be taking their place in the councils of war and who now are not there to take it. So we have our international councils and our political affairs—I am speaking of England now. I don't know very much about Canadian politics—still very much in the hands of people whose minds were hard set before the war. The younger people are not old enough to take the responsibility from them; there are so few of my generation there to take it, and I think that gap is a constant reminder of the waste and futility of that type of war that involves the best of civilization and kills them off.

I also mean the book to be literature insofar as I could write literature. I didn't want it to be direct propaganda. There is a great work for direct propaganda to do and I am very glad that Beverley Nichol's book, "Cry Havoc," has had such a great success in this programme because I think that it puts certain problems connected with the manufacture of munitions, which can be very dull for the ordinary person to read about if they just appear in newspapers and pamphlets, in a most interesting light, and I think Beverley Nichols did a great work in making readable that particular type of war propaganda. I didn't just have that object in mind. I wanted the story I told to present a moral, if one can call it a moral, just by the sheer reality of the events of the story I had to tell. I didn't want to say until the end what my own conclusions were, except quite indirectly.

Some people, particularly those who haven't read it, have suggested that "Testament of Youth" is chiefly an appeal to the emotions. A very well known woman critic in reviewing my book said, that while she must admit she hadn't read "Testament of Youth"—she was reading the poems—it would appear that the author holds it in her power to touch the human heart. She is a very fine poet herself and is inclined to be sarcastic of a mediocre poet such as I am. I would like to say to her and to everybody else that "Testament of Youth" was not intended to be, primarily, an appeal to the human heart. It was intended to appeal to the human head, although it had to give from the point of view I started to write it, a complete view of the shattering effects of war on the most intimate human relationships. Although such pictures cannot help but be moving to others who shared experiences of that kind, I didn't intend to make people weep; I wanted to make them think, because all the weeping in the world won't prevent another war. It is only thought that will do that. That is one of the things I find myself having to say so often to women. Women still, as a whole are prepared to demonstrate in favour of peace but they are not yet prepared to study intensively the questions with which any complete picture of war and peace is tied up. I would like to see fewer women demonstrating vehemently in favour of peace and many more having a really intelligent idea of what lies at the back of those questions. I do not say that it is only women who do that but because I am a woman I am prepared to indict my sex and not yours. I do say it is equally true of men.

In effect, "Testament of Youth" tries to say to the reader and this is, I suppose, my philosophy, if one can state one's philosophy in a few phrases, this wastage of life and youth and joy actually happened and from it has resulted the world we know—the world of unemployment and chaos and depression in which every activity of life is hampered by lack of the first class men who fell in the war. Do you think that anything which has happened since has made that wastage worth while? Do you want such ruin to happen again? If not, what are you going to do about it? For if you don't do something that tragedy is bound to recur.

Well, this book fell, naturally, into three parts with, of course, the highest tension at the concluding moment of the war when we weren't quite sure they weren't absolutely the concluding moments—the last year of the war we weren't quite sure whether we were going to win it or not.

I have been asked to read one of the passages about that high point of the war which has been selected to be broadcast on Armistice Day in Great Britain as a part of the British Broadcasting Company's programme, entitled, "Nineteen Eighteen." I am sorry if this bores you—I am reading by request and maybe some of you who went through the experiences with me will remember them as I do and will forgive me, I am sure, for writing about what is so much less of experience for a woman, what could mean so much less risk to a woman at the base than it meant to you at the Front. When I think of the men who read my book, I always have a sort of inferiority complex because, for a long time, I thought a woman oughtn't to try to write a book about the war at all. That barrier of experience is always between us and you know so much I never can know! But I just had to put down what that experience meant to me.

"However long I may be destined to survive my friends who went down in the Flood, I shall never forget the crushing tension of those extreme days. Nothing had ever quite equalled them before—not the Somme, not Arras, not Passchendaele—for into our minds had crept for the first time the secret, incredible fear that we might lose the War. Each convoy of men that we took in—to be despatched, a few hours later, to England after a hasty wash and change of dressing, or to the cemetery after a laying-out too hurried to be reverent—gave way to a discouragement the none of us had met with in a great battle before.

"There's only a handful of us, Sister, and there seem to be thousands of them!" was the perpetual cry whether the patient came from Bapaume or Peronne or St. Quentin, where the enemy hordes, released from the Eastern Front, were trying to smash the Allied resistance before the rescuing Americans arrived in force. Day after day, while civilian refugees fled panic-stricken into Etaples from threatened villages further up the line, and the wounded, often unattended, came down in anything that would carry them—returning lorries, A.S.C. ambulances and even cattle-trucks—some fresh enemy conquest was first incredulously whispered and then published tentatively abroad. One after another, Peronne, Bapaume, Beaumont Hamel, were gone and on March 27th Albert itself was taken. Even Paris, we learnt, had been shelled by a long-range gun from seventy-five miles away. Gradually we became conscious that we were in the midst of what a War historian afterwards called, "The most formidable offensive in the history of the world."

"On the 4th of April, after a fortnight of fourteen-hour days, with the operating theatres going day and night, the "Fall-In" sounding continuously, and the day staff taking it in turns to be called up to help with night convoys, we limped wearily into the Mess for supper to hear a new and yet more hair-raising rumour.

"The Germans are in the suburbs of Amiens!" it ran round the tables.

We looked at each other, speechless, with blanched faces; I was probably as pale as the rest for I felt as though cold fingers were exploring my viscera. We were already becoming a Casualty Clearing Station, with only the advance units at Abbeville between ourselves and the line; how much longer should we be able to remain where we were? How long until we too fled before the grey uniforms advancing down the road from Camiers? This horror......monstrous, undreamed of, incredible...... this was defeat. That night we began to pack our boxes. Each evening when we came off duty, we wondered whether the morning would find us still at our posts."

Then it describes how for a fortnight that state of tension went on and then occurred an incident which many of you will remember as having pulled together people far more important than the nurses who were at the base in the hospitals.

"Three weeks of such days and nights, lived without respite or off-duty time under the permanent fear of defeat and flight, reduced the staffs of the Etaples hospitals to the negative conviction that nothing mattered except to end the strain. England, panic-stricken, was frantically raising the military age to fifty and agreeing to the appointment of Foch as Commander-in-Chief, but to us with our blistered feet, our swollen hands, our wakeful, reddened eyes, victory and defeat began—as indeed they were afterwards to prove—to seem very much the same thing. On April 11th, after a dizzying rush of wounded from the new German offensive at Armentieres, I stumbled up to the Sisters' quarters for lunch with the certainty that I could not go on—and saw, pinned up on the notice-board in the Mess, Sir Douglas Haig's "Special Order of the Day." Standing there spellbound, with fatigue and despair forgotten, I read the words which put courage into so many men and woman whose need of endurance was far greater than my own."

And, I think, as we are so near to Armistice Day, it is perhaps well to remember, to recall the very fine words with which that manifesto ended:

"There is no course open to us but to fight it out. Every position must be held to the last man; there must be no retirement. With our backs to the wall and believing in the justice of our cause each one of us must fight on to the end. The safety of our homes and the Freedom of mankind alike depend upon the conduct of each one of us at this critical moment."

I suppose that the philosophy that is behind "Testament of Youth" is an attempt to show that the safety of our homes and the freedom of mankind still depend to a large extent, perhaps to as great an extent as it did in the War, upon the conduct of each one of us at this critical moment. We fought in the war and if we were defeatists we were regarded as very poor spirited people and yet when we encounter difficulties in this business of working for peace, we think it is quite all right to give way at the first difficulty, and so we say, "O, well, it won't work. The war machinery is a part of man; it is human nature and you cannot conquer human nature". In the war we had to conquer a good deal of human nature; we had to conquer fatigue and fear and death which, I suppose, is the last enemy human nature is ever capable of conquering. It seems to me, when we were able to do this thing in a time of war, we should be able to do it more so in the less dramatic, but none the less dramatic task of reconstruction.

So the last section of this book endeavours to point out that the endeavour to live for a country instead of dying for it was something just as important and perhaps requires a greater amount of courage than the splendid courage which laid down life in the war. That at any rate, is, I think, the only kind of appeal we can make to the youth of the present day. As I said last night, they are anxious to work, anxious to sacrifice themselves and perhaps our task today lies in trying to persuade them that the greater, grander glory lies in repudiating the glory of the flag, and in working for that distant and more difficult thing which we call a New Order, based upon the ruins of the past, but looking forward to something which those of us here will never see but which involves, as I tried to express in that quotation from Cicero in the beginning of the third part of "Testament of Youth," where you read he said, "So at last I care far more for that long age I shall never see than for the little I hold of time."

Well, "Testament of Youth" is an endeavour to try to persuade people to work for that long age even though they won't see it, instead of giving way to the passions and the hatreds and the dangers and the difficulties that occur to all of us in the little that we hold of time.

Well, I haven't really very much more to say. Some people have tried to make me account for the reason why this particular message I have tried to give has been received with such great kindness on both sides of the Atlantic. I can explain it, perhaps, only in two ways: first of all, that I did put into the book very intimate pictures of human relationships, very intimate incidents of love and grief and pain which are interesting, perhaps, for people to read but for which I have been criticized a good deal for making use of. I didn't do that for any reason of sensationalism or because I wanted to advertise myself or make people sorry for me. The last thing I wanted to do was to make people sorry for me. Let them grieve, if they wish, for those who didn't survive as I had the fortune to survive into this business of reconstruction. There is inspiration in reconstruction for if death is the end it is further opportunity. I did this because I thought it was one of the most effective ways of trying to persuade the youth of tomorrow to abstain from war, to try to seek any alternative to war that may be available because if they understand what war did to the most intimate human relationships, at least they would know the whole story and wouldn't be deceived by the kind of official records that remind most of us of the wars of the past history books and in official documents. If you read of the Napoleonic War you get the idea that it is really rather glorious, rather exciting and a great many important things happened, and you don't get the reaction of the ordinary man and woman. You don't get the record of the wives who lost fathers or the babies starved to death in one particular blockade. I wanted to tell what war did to human psychology and those precious relationships between lovers, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, and parents and children, of which the stuff of our private lives is made up for all of us. I felt if they knew that, if they understood what war did to a private life, they would understand something more of the whole story than they ever could from official records. If they choose to go to war after that they at least know what they are going to get. They won't be deceived into thinking as my generation did, that war was grand, glorious, that these other things did not matter, that the suffering is comparatively unimportant.

That is one thing and the other thing is a change in the character of personel books themselves and a change in the attitude toward them. When I was first starting to write this book a young friend of mine, on being told I was doing an autobiography and not a novel said, very frankly, "I shouldn't have thought anything in your life was worth recording." That is the attitude, I think, of a past day when we thought people only justified in writing of themselves or their works if they were monarchs or statesmen or ambassadors whose names were known all over the world but today, with the development of psychology and the growth of Democracy, we have come to be interested in the life of the ordinary person, to feel that the ordinary person is perhaps more significant than the statesman because he is not artificially raised by humanity to his official position but that he or she shares the experiences which might come to any one of us and might make decisions that at some future times in our lives we, ourselves, might make. So life for an ordinary person, lived at a time when great events are likely to happen, has come, perhaps, to be the kind of autobiography which is most valuable to the type of world in which we are going to have to live in when the ordinary man and woman is coming to count more and more the history of the facts.

So, perhaps it is not vain glorious to hope that "Testament of Youth" may have that message I have suggested to the youth of tomorrow, may perhaps have some slight influence in deterring the young of the next generation from going to war without at least a great deal more thought than my generation put into the business of going to war and I hope it may have this effect upon them —not because it is in any way a literary masterpiece; I don't claim that for a moment, but because it is a story of a very typical woman who happened to live in a stupendous age. (Prolonged applause.)

Immediately following her address, Miss Brittain was presented with a beautiful sheaf of roses, the presentation being made by Professor E. H. Morrow of the MacMillan Publishing Company.

MR. DANA PORTER: I think that perhaps everyone is always most interested to tap for a moment the springs of creative genius and to get some inside view of the purpose behind the books that we read and the initiative which has created them. I think you will perhaps agree with me that one of the most striking features of Miss Brittain's address today is that she has revealed to us that she sees events not only in a perspective from the point of view of the past, but she sees them in a perspective from the point of view of the future.

I wish on behalf of the Club, to thank you, Miss Brittain, very much indeed for your most unusual and interesting address.

PRESENT POSITION OF THE U.S.S.R.

AN ADDRESS BY MR. ALLAN MONKHOUSE.

November 8, 1934.

MR. ALLAN MONKHOUSE, the guest speaker, was introduced by MR. DANA PORTER, President of The Empire Club.

PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, on behalf of the Club, I wish to welcome to the meeting today a large number of guests of the Club and, particularly, the President and delegates of the Canadian Education Association, who are with us today.

I would also like to point out to those of you whose status is deficient in respect to not being a member of the Club, that we can easily put that right in a very few moments and I trust some of you will see fit to do so.

From time to time this Club has heard from men who have travelled in Russia. We have been given the benefit of impressions, generally first impressions, of people who have had the opportunity of being in Russia for a very temporary period of time. Naturally, the first impressions of such travellers, while they may be exceedingly picturesque and vivid and of very great value, nevertheless they are bound to be coloured to a great extent by the preconceived political views and the social philosophies of the particular observants.

Today, we welcome Mr. Allan Monkhouse who has lived for over twenty years in Russia. During the old regime, throughout the Great War and the Revolution and under the Five-Year Plan, Mr. Monkhouse has carried on business from day to day and has been in constant contact with the Russian people. We know him, particularly, for the part he played in a famous criminal trial which was held at Moscow and even though he there met with a certain bitter experience and perhaps saw an unfortunate side of Russian life, nevertheless I understand that Mr. Monkhouse is by no means embittered and still holds in very high esteem the Russian people and, perhaps, even the Russian Government.

It is with very great pleasure that I call on Mr. Allan Monkhouse. (Applause).

MR. ALLAN MONKHOUSE: Mr. President and Gentlemen: Yesterday and on the previous day, no doubt the people in Moscow were celebrating the seventeenth anniversary of their having come into power and I don't doubt that in Moscow they have been indulging in those familiar speeches where they congratulated themselves on the success which they have claimed to have had.

Today, in this particular, I want to tell you something of what it appears to me has taken place in that country during the last seventeen years and, particularly, during more recent years, the extent to which they are succeeding and all the troubles and the setbacks which they are experiencing and the effects which those setbacks are having upon the people in Russia today, because the plan, of course, is not going completely a hundred percent. I do not think that anybody, even those responsible for making the plan, ever thought it would.

Before bringing myself to speak of the more recent events, it is necessary, I think, to quite briefly scan over some of the work that was done in the preliminary years because if we don't more clearly understand that work, it makes it all the more difficult to understand what is occurring at the present day in Russia.

When Lenin and his friends suddenly found themselves in power in 1917, I think it is very questionable whether they ever had any idea as to how they were going to put into being the imaginary and theoretical principles they then held. For the first few years, then, they were quite unable to set to work to actually start construction or reconstruction work. During that time, the decrees and the laws they issued and the steps they took were designed, of course, simply to meet the immediate needs of the moment. They had to fight off the attacks made on them by the white armies and by 1919 and 1920, they found themselves having to fight famine and altogether the country got into a very serious state of chaos and disorder.

In 1920 they looked around and when they saw the state the country was in they felt that the only possible way to get out of the difficulty was to introduce that policy which came to be known as the New Economic Policy and that was a temporary measure, a temporary expedient and was virtually private capitalism reintroduced. That went on from 1921 to 1928 and during those years the country certainly picked up very considerably and took on quite a different aspect.

During that time the Soviet Government went to work and did quite a considerable amount of preparatory work—preparatory construction work in preparation for bringing in the Five-Year Plan. I only mention that because it was that work that took us to Russia in 1923 to 1924. That preparatory work included the building of a very large electrical net work and of a number of power stations in different parts of the country and it also included the making of a very complete survey of all their natural resources, and as well as that, sending engineers and scientific workers, professors and others to America, to England and Germany and other countries to study modern scientific methods and various methods of industrial production in order that all that information might be used when the Plan itself was put into being in 1928.

In 1928, they felt themselves strong enough to start the Plan itself and the first thing they did was to set the tax collector to work to tax out of existence as quickly as possible the private business, the private works and shops that had grown up under the period of the New Economic Policy in order that their place might be taken by state-owned and state-controlled concerns. Unfortunately, the tax collectors worked too quickly as you will see later and many of the poorer businesses were taxed out of existence before the state was in a position to put anything in their place.

The Plan itself included providing for almost every phase of the people's life. It not only included the complete reconstruction of the economic forces and the development of their economic resources, but it also covered plans for the people's education and for their welfare. It included a state medical service and provision for the study of art and music, for athletics, sports and everything of that kind. All those activities and all those sides of the people's life were properly considered by the incoming authorities when they drew up their plan in Moscow.

Perhaps the most spectacular side, however, of the work they have already accomplished, the one that has attracted the most attention in the outside world, has been what they have done in industry. Therefore, I propose to deal with that first because, incidentally, it is that work in which the greatest action is to be shown, and the greatest action is shown, incidentally, to people who visit the Union.

In industry, they contented themselves for the first two or three years in developing work in the western district of European Russia, particularly in Leningrad District. It was a particularly tragic thing to do. The district should never have been developed as an industrial center; it is much too far removed from sources of raw material and markets. They went ahead at that time in developing their oil industry because they found that was a ready and quick source of revenue and they wanted foreign currency in order to purchase more equipment.

After two years they turned their attention to the

Ural Mountains and the development of the eastern District. Time, I am afraid, will not permit me to dwell at any length on work in the Ural Mountains but they certainly put through some big engineering projects in that district. It was more important in 1931 when the industrial plans were seriously influenced by the fear of an attack that suddenly grew within them, from the Far East, and they definitely began to change their industrial plans and concentrated their attention on quickly developing those industries which could be quickly diverted to war purposes.

That was one of the influences that worked upon them and caused them to suddenly turn their attention to the central Siberian District, that is the district immediately around Tomsk, the best known town in that district. There, they are blessed with almost every natural resource that could be desired. There are fine coal deposits, fine copper, zinc—almost every mineral, with the exception of tin. There is no tin in the Soviet Union. There are fine forests and fine agricultural land. There is good wheat land to the west, in the center of Siberia. To the immediate south they built a railway, linking that rich territory with the Central Asian District, the Turkmenistan District where they grow the cotton crops and where, incidentally, through their planning scheme, they are growing practically eighty per cent of the total amount of cotton they require for their textile factories.

True, this development that is going on in Central Siberia is one we haven't heard much about in the outside world. To my mind it is one of the most important because though it may be decided at the moment with a military idea at the back of their minds, we sincerely hope, I think, that will not be necessary and that they will come to more amicable relations with their Far Eastern neighbours. On the other hand the development of industry in that district is going to put them in an extraordinarily strong position in developing the power situation over Mongolia and Afghanistan and many of the other countries immediately around.

Incidentally, they do look on these countries as natural markets. While referring to that as their natural market, I might refer to the general question that frequently arises as to whether all this industrial development work in Russia is designed for their coming out into the outside world as competitors, to compete with us in our markets, and I think you will find, although they have spent $825,000,000 on equipment, both in this country, in America and in England and in Germany, too; though they have spent that large amount of money, their industrial equipment is still hopelessly inadequate for other than the supplying of home demand for many, many years to come. I think it is very questionable if they will be in a position for many years to come to compete in the outside market. What they have done in dumping manufactured commodities on the European market has been done more or less as a desperate attempt, in order to prevent themselves falling down, to finance commitments when they were unable to get the prices they expected for their natural exported raw materials. I think that the bogey of Russia building a big industrial development scheme in order to compete in the world markets is something quite unfounded, except in the Central Asian markets.

Now, time does not permit me to talk at any length about what they have actually achieved in building up these industries. Perhaps their biggest work has been done in aeroplane construction, tractor building and certain of the heavier engineering and basic industries. I think that was one of the mistakes they have made. They have rushed ahead too rapidly with the basic industries and they have neglected to develop the lighter industries which supply them with the ordinary commodities, such as boots and shoes and things of that kind. It was one of the serious mistakes and they recognize it now and if you look at the programme you find there very little provision for the further development of heavy industry and that the main attention is being directed to developing light industries—commodities the people require.

In actual industry itself and in the working of these big plants they have built, they are definitely getting a considerable amount of success. Actually, they are getting more success than many of us thought they would—even those of us who lived very close to them. I think it is very important when we think of that success which they are getting that we should realize that the methods which they are employing to control industry, the actual—what you might call the mechanics of industry—the control of work differs practically not at all from what we have in our capitalist countries. They have gone back entirely from the idea they had in 1917—the syndicalism of control of work and factory by local committees—and they have put these factories entirely in single handed control, entirely in the hands of state-appointed individuals who answer directly through trust organizations to the Supreme Economic Council or to the bodies now taking the place of the Supreme Economic Council, that is to say the light industries, the heavy industries and the timber industry.

Now, the way industry is controlled is almost identical with what we have in our own country. That is one important point. The other important point is that they have completely departed from the idea of equal pay. I remember in the days after the Revolution, the tremendous fights we had with the work committees and the trade unions when they tried to introduce the ideas to us. In those days they had the idea that there should be practically equal pay for all people. That is completely gone in industry and is going almost everywhere else throughout the Union. Nowadays, the workers in the factory, the semi-skilled factory worker, can get something around 125 or 150 rubles a month, as a basic rate; the labourer, perhaps, fifty-five rubles. Foremen get 400 or 500 rubles and the senior executive officers may get as much as 1000 or 1400 rubles a month. So you see the scales of pay differ very little indeed from that which we have in our own country. They have completely reintroduced piece work and they are working on piece work almost everywhere throughout the Union.

I think that the fact that they have introduced practically the same methods we employ in our countries is one of the things that is contributing more than anything else to the success they are getting in their industrial programmes.

So much then, for what has happened in industry.

I have already referred to the fact that in developing their industries they were evidently much influenced in 1931 by the fear of war. I might mention here that they are building up quite a strong army which they contend, and I believe they honestly contend, is intended for defence purposes. Anything of the nature of war would be a serious thing to the Soviet Union at the present time. On the other hand they have definitely, or they pretend to have felt anyhow, the menace from the Far East and have built up a strong army and an extremely strong air fleet to endeavour to counter that menace.

Let us speak for a few moments about agriculture. That, perhaps, is the most important thing in the Soviet Union at the present time and the agricultural situation is much different from the industrial. You find a very different state of affairs in agriculture. The trouble, perhaps originally began there in 1917 when Lenin and his friends, wishing to carry the peasants with them and get their assistance to fight off the white armies, permitted them to take over the estates of the old landed proprietors and assume almost ownership over them. This breaking up of the fine estates which were responsible for the growth of the largest proportion of the grain Russia used to export, was a very serious matter, indeed. And following that, Lenin very quickly realized that so long as over a hundred million people of Russia's population were small proprietors and peasants working their own land in their own way there never would be a Communist majority in that country, if they had a real proper open election, a ballot box election as we know it. Realizing that, he thought it was necessary to take some steps to make that mass of people into what he called "wage earners and proletarians." In other words, he had to bring in some form of legislation that would take the land from them, that would stop private enterprize among the peasants and make them workers for the state in one way or another. That was done by introducing large state farms where the people who work in agriculture are direct employees of the government. Introducing the collectivization idea does not necessarily mean that the peasants work for the state but the way they have it organized it comes to that because all the agricultural machinery, the tractors and other equipment is leased out and farmed to the peasants by the state and is paid for in kind by grain grown on the farms. So, in that way, they keep the whip hand expertly over them and virtually make the peasants into state workers.

The idea back of the collectivization idea is to make these people so they are proletarians, as they say, and it is therefore much easier for the government to spread the Communistic ideas among them. That is the idea at the back of bringing in the plan; that is the reason they forced it through. It was a very risky experiment in the way they have done it. The peasants naturally resist and resist it hard. The older peasants, the so-called Kulaks, took steps to try and prevent the grain collection in the villages and stopped growing their crops. The government immediately retaliated by taking these people from the villages and deporting them to the timber camps in the north and caused them to cut timber under very difficult and serious conditions. They were deported to the sites of canal development schemes and other schemes under the supervision of the government. That left the villages in the hands of the less experienced and younger peasants. Naturally, the richer peasants were the men who had made the best show at farming and they were all in the hands of these agitators and organizers sent down from the towns to organize them politically and to group them into collective farms. The result has been very serious indeed. Many of the villages fail to get anything like the results they should have got. The crops were so far short of what was demanded of them and what was far more serious is that before the peasant enters these farms, many of the richer and middle class peasants discovered that it was only necessary to have a certain amount of live stock, a certain number of horses and cattle to qualify for membership of the farms. Therefore, before entering the farms, they slew the remainder of their stock and sold the meat and the skins and in that way they very seriously depleted the herds and the income of Russia.

The seriousness of this was only realized this year when Stalin quoted figures in Moscow to show that from 1929 to the present year the amount of live stock in Russia has decreased by more than half. There aren't half as many animals on the farms in Russia today as there were in 1929. For instance, the number of horses that have been killed is seventeen and a half million, out of a total of thirty-four million horses. The argument, of course, is that they have made tractors to take their place. That is not strictly true because the total number of tractors is still something like 350,000, and that is not going to take the place of seventeen and a half million horses which have been killed or have died within the last five years. So you see the agricultural position is very serious.

Then, the wheat crops have not matured in the way they expected. They have not managed to get the wheat crops they anticipated and the crop this year is just about the same as they got in 1913. That means that they are going to have very little wheat, indeed, to export. Although in 1913, they had quite a considerable amount to export from their crop, you must remember that at the present time the population of that country has grown immensely. It is growing at the rate of 3,000,000 a year and there are 32,000,000 more people in Russia today than in 1913, so the fact that they only have the same crop as in 1913, I think, indicates that they are going to have very little wheat to export. As a matter of fact, I think the same thing applies to their oil, too. You will find, in the very near future, that they are rapidly increasing their automobile industry and the number of tractors they are using and the growth of their industrial work as a whole will mean that they are not going to have any surplus of oil for export, either.

So, I think both those two exports are ones we need not necessarily consider seriously in thinking of Russia. They want what they grow in wheat and what they produce in oil for their own requirements.

Now, pass from that to a question of distribution, another serious factor in the lives of the people in Russia today. They set to work in 1928 to tax out of existence all private shop keepers and private distributors and put the whole thing in the hands of the co-operatives. The co-operatives are not sufficiently organized and not strong enough to really cope with the matter thoroughly. Remember, they struggled hard with it. Nevertheless, in 1931 and 1932 food lines again appeared in the cities, Moscow and elsewhere, which were simply caused by failure on the part of the co-operative authorities to organize the distribution properly. So, they had serious distribution troubles.

Now, in the actual crisis of food stuffs there, an interesting thing has happened. I should have said when I was referring to industry, and I might say now, that wages in the Soviet Union have increased during the last five years. They have increased approximately sixty or seventy per cent. So, it looks on the face of it as though the standard of living ought to increase, but when you examine food prices you find that prices of Russian commodities—and all essential foods are rationed in the same way as in our countries during the war—have increased more than sixty per cent. So far as food and clothing is concerned, the standard of living has not improved the last five years. Rationed commodities are only issued to trade unions and to state employees and to those people who are, you might say, in good standing with the government. All the people who are disenfranchised, such as priests and people not in good standing with the government do not get rations and therefore have to purchase their food stuffs in the same way as workers getting food money—they have to purchase excess food stuffs. Anything they want in addition to the ration, they must purchase from special stores which they call "commercial co-operative stores", where they pay four or five times the price they pay from the rations shop. It is an extraordinary state of affairs. The worker goes along and gets so much food. He goes next door and buys some more and pays four or five times as much.

That shows why it is you cannot give any definite figure for the value of the ruble in Russia, or outside, for that matter.

In addition, there is another kind of store, known as the torgsin. It is a trade store, primarily designed for foreigners. It only trades with those from foreign countries. Those establishments have gone all over Russia because it is means of getting hoarded gold out of the pockets of the Russians.

Another new and interesting development is that they have set up the stores in the gold mining district, in the mineral valley, and they are encouraging Russians to go and work as private prospectors, washing gold and bringing it in and changing it for commodities in the stores. This is a new policy and it is something of importance that will definitely affect the gold position of Russia during the next few years. I wouldn't be surprised if this year's gold production is not something like twice what it was two years ago, due to the fact, not that the state is producing more gold, but that private prospectors are being encouraged to go back and wash gold and sell it for commodities.

Now, briefly, I want to refer to the transport situation. I have not much to say about that except that it is such that the Russians have been severely criticized for not developing transport systems quickly enough. They contend that they have studied the transport systems in America and particularly in Canada and they say that they don't want to overdevelop their railway system. (Laughter). I am afraid I don't know much about Canadian politics. Apparently that is the opinion they reached when they came over here. Apparently what they are contenting themselves with doing is developing the existing main lines, to make them into four-track lines, if necessary, and to electrify them, increasing their carrying capacity and then they are going to distribute from those lines on good roads with motor trucks.

That explains why it is they have American engineers to help with the grading of roads and the putting down of large factories to manufacture motor trucks.

In dealing with the transport situation, there is one other point I would like to mention. This brings us to one of the most unsatisfactory sides. In developing their canals—they have done some big canal development work in the north—they are using forced labour everywhere. It is done under the supervision of the Ogpu. The canal that joins the White Sea and the Baltic Sea was cut through in the short space of twenty months and the work was done by "50,000 people," all under the Ogpu. As long as the Russian Government permits the Ogpu to handle big undertakings of that kind and recruit the labour in the way they do, they are making a very serious mistake and a serious violation of the liberty of the subjects in that country.

I must briefly refer to housing work and other social welfare work. In housing, I should say, they have a tremendous amount of headway to make up. They are certainly building fine houses around Moscow but they are still hopelessly inadequate to house the people now going into the industrial district. They are well built but hopelessly short, except in some of the houses for the more favoured higher officials. You don't get the same overcrowding there and there is no doubt there is a certain privileged class now growing up around the government.

I don't want to refer at any length to medical work. It is all being done extraordinarily well. One of the things that strikes people is the good work being done in decreasing infant mortality. It is one of he most interesting things I have seen. In the old days, the number of children who died in the summer was terrible. That is completely stopped. The children are removed to sanitariums and rest houses outside of the towns and the very heavy infantile death rate has tremendously improved.

So I think that is one of the reasons why it is that you find the population of Russia increasing at the rate it is. It is going up at the rate of three million a year. It is not necessarily that there are so many more but the infantile death rate is down so considerably.

That brings us to the educational problem. There again, there is quite a lot of good work, very excellent work. However, there is a great amount to make up. In all senior work they are making the mistake of rather specializing with men too young, and the education is not sufficiently liberal. They say that is a necessity because of the fact that they desire to get the men trained as rapidly as possible to take executive positions in industry and science. I think, ultimately, they will have to amend the educational system and make it much wider. When you come in contact with the young men you find how narrow their education has been.

Then, I want to refer quite briefly to the religious question. They have said that they want to remove the superstition among the workers from their lives but they said at the outset that they were not going to do it by direct attack. Therefore, they are going to do it subversively and this is the way they are attacking religion itself. It is a serious matter although the young people don't seem to notice the absence of religion in their lives but when the period is over, we think they will settle down and find the lack of religion in their lives and they will want religion brought back into their lives. At the present time the government is trying to force on the people this materialistic idea of atheism and of preventing them from learning anything about the ordinary religous teachings in any form.

Another thing that also arises in connection with the Russian question is the attack they made in the early days on home life and marriage. That, I am glad to say, is being stopped and it is very interesting to note at the present time they definitely appear to be realizing that that was a mistake. Quite recently, Kavinovitch, Stalin's right hand man,, made the statement that the strength of the Anglo-Saxon people lies in their firesides. When they talk that way, I think they are coming to see sensibly on that side of the problem, as well.

With reference to the marriage law, we do not think that the easy divorce law introduced is being abused in anything like the way we thought it was. It seems that though divorce is so extraordinarily easy to obtain, they don't seem to take advantage as we might anticipate.

Time is going rapidly and I want to refer to sports and athletics. That is something that you used not to find in the lives of the Russian people in the old days. Nowadays, quite considerable attention is being paid by the government to the development of sports, athletics, music, opera and everything of that kind. A great deal of good work is being done. Although there are many things against the Soviet, in that particular direction they are doing good work.

In concluding the general remarks about the general conditions of living, I do want to make it clear, although they are getting a certain amount of success in their industry and in the other activities just referred to, nevertheless, in that country agriculture is very seriously threatening the whole at the moment and also, that we can not view with anything but the greatest disfavour their attack on religion and the absence of freedom that you feel in that country when you live and work in it.

Everywhere people are in terror of that secret police organization, the Ogpu. The Ogpu deliberately maintain people in that state of terror. I think that many of the stories of what they do to the people when they get them in the provinces are actually started in order to keep the people in a state of terror. I actually doubt whether they take place but they keep the people in a state of terror.

I think you find people in the Union under this government, the young people, particularly, who are content; they are keen and thoroughly enthusiastic, but that only applies to people say, under 32 or 33 years of age. The people who have grown up with the regime have seen a gradual and slow improvement since 1931 and have been led to believe the improvement will go steadily on until they get a standard of living higher than anywhere else in the world. That, however, only applies to the young people and I think you will find the older people do not share that enthusiasm and keenness—particularly, the older peasants, the older intelligensia are very much to be sympathized with. The older intelligensia in the other days did much to help it but now that others are trained the government has jettisoned them and I think they are very much to be sympathized with.

Generally speaking, I think the sacrifices these people have been called on to make a very great sacrifice, indeed. I also feel that the sacrifice they have been called on to make, that they say is for future generations, is almost too great. Nevertheless, I think the Soviet Government is firmly in power and come what may, they intend to forward their plans.

Now, there are a few minutes left and I want to speak of events that took place in Moscow the beginning of last year. You see from what I said that the Soviet did not get quite the satisfaction they expected from carrying out the Five-Year Plan. So Stalin called together the government and executives of the Communist body and made a speech in which he reviewed what had happened. He reviewed the successes and the failures. When he reviewed the failures he pointed out these failures, chiefly due to the action of wreckers, saboters and others, working against the Soviet Union. I think we have seen that was not the case, that that was due to political mistakes. Nevertheless, Stalin's speech was very strong and called for action on the part of the political police in order to demonstrate that his statements were correct. They got to work very quickly and immediately found plots among the medical workers, the food distributing people and among the agricultural workers and they announced, on the day we were arrested that they had shot thirty-five people in the communities where the agricultural work was going on for interfering with agriculture. Whether they were shot or not, I don't know. I shook hands eighteen months after with some of the people that were shot.

They wanted a big plot to have a big trial in Russia. They had big trials in the old days. More recently, late in 1927, they had a trial in which the Germans figure. They had another in 1921 and they wanted another, so they chose the electric power stations—it was something that everybody was interested in. They evidently wanted to bring in foreigners to make it more interesting. They decided to bring in the British engineers. This was largely dictated because at that time they were greatly annoyed with Great Britain because at that time we had found it necessary to amend our trading agreement with them as a result of the arrangements we had reached at Ottawa the previous summer. That was one of the reasons they did not hesitate to bring in the British. In choosing the victims, there was only one firm to choose from. The firm which I represented had been working on the power stations. In selecting personnel, they chose one man—they chose my old friend and colleague, Leslie Thornton. They chose him because of his family name. His name was the same as that of a family which were previously the owners of the biggest textile firm in Russia. I think that was why they tried to make him the center of that trial.

It came to our knowledge that something was wrong. I sensed it in January. I went home to London and reported it and then came back. They only waited for me to come back to make the arrest. They arrested me on the 11th of March. That was done by the Ogpu without the full knowledge of the government. Immediately the Ministers of the heavy industries and the Ministers of trade, and the head of the Five-Year Plan himself got to know about it. They evidently moved—in fact, we know they moved—and that is why I was released almost forty-eight hours after I was arrested. I was in the fortunate position of seeing the inside of the Lubianka prison for forty-eight hours. That was quite enough, I assure you. The British Government moved and took a very strong and firm attitude, indeed. That was something they never expected. I think the Russians had it in mind that the company I was associated with was associated with the big armament firm of Vickers. They did not realize that that was not entirely the case. I think that was one reason they thought the British Government would not interfere. It was rather a shock when the British Government came down as they did with a firm hand. That brought them to their senses but the thing had gone so far that they could not back out and they had to go through a farce of a trial with all the propaganda trappings for their own propaganda purposes. They had to save their faces in front of their own people. That is the way we looked at it through the trial. I am afraid we got a lot of sympathy that we did not deserve. We felt that they were playing out an act and the result seemed a foregone conclusion. Many funny things occurred during the trial. We were quite at liberty. They were doing their best to treat us well. They realized that they would have to let us go and they wanted us to go back and tell a good story. I was at liberty and I used to go to my office and attend to my ordinary office duties every morning and then would go to the trial. Incidentally, I used to ring up my home on the telephone to have a conversation with my wife and tell her not to worry. In fact, I spoke to her every morning throughout the trial.

One day, the President of the Council on Imports had the nerve to call me to talk business with me, and I had to expain to him that I had to go down to the court at ten o'clock. It explains the general attitude toward us. When the verdict was brought in, I think it was just about as near an acquittal as we could possibly get, having in mind that they had to save their faces in front of their people. Nevertheless, they did establish the general idea that there must have been some wrecking activities. In fact people say that there must have been fire somewhere or there wouldn't have been any smoke. However, about three months after the trial was over, they published reports for all the power stations and it showed that the ten power stations which we were supposed to be busy wrecking had all better operating characteristics than any single power station in Great Britain in 1932. I do not think that that indicates that we were extraordinarily bad wreckers. (Prolonged applause).

MUNITIONS

AN ADDRESS BY U. S. SENATOR NYE

Thursday, November 15, 1934.

MR. DANA PORTER: Gentlemen, the struggle that gave rise to Democracy was, to some considerable extent, a struggle against privilege. However, when this monster at last seemed to be almost conquered it reared its head again in a sort of bootleg form, and we call that vaster privilege by the bald, but expressive monosyllabic word, GRAFT.

Our guest of honour today, throughout his public life in the United States of America has established himself as the arch enemy of graft. (Applause.) From the time of the Tea-Pot Dome investigation which he was largely responsible for initiating, down to the present day, he has identified himself with the untiring efforts that have been made to kill this deep-seated blight upon Democratic, political life and today, as Chairman of the Arms Inquiry Committee of the Senate at Washington, he seeks to wrest the secrets of what he considers to be the most insidious and dangerous form of graft known to our civilization, that is the graft which has crept into the armament industry.

In this subject we are all most vitally interested and the inquiry that is being carried on under the Chairmanship of our guest of honour, we will follow with the greatest care.

It is with very great pleasure that I present Senator Nye who has come to Toronto at the invitation of the Empire Club.

SENATOR NYE: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen of the Empire Club: I think I need not tell you that I am highly honoured, first, in having the invitation to come and then in having so delightful and large an audience as you have gathered about these tables today.

Yet, I come to you with an apology, an apology for a state of voice I suppose I had better first explain. We have just come through a rather strenuous campaign of "politicking" down in the States and I have tried to take my part in that engagement. In my own State, I found myself in opposition to a candidate for Governor who was a woman. I was not opposing her because she was a woman, primarily, but because she was vowing that her election would witness the pursuance of her husband's policies, policies which, by the way had resulted for her husband in a sentence to the Federal Penitentiary. When you go forth to battle against a candidate who is a woman, you must first of all, plan to speak often, plan to speak loud, and plan to speak continuously, if you want to be heard at all. Having done that and having followed since election day with many lectures, I find myself with a throat that is not bothersome to me, is not at all sore but a throat that I know inflicts great punishment upon those who punish themselves to the extent of sitting and listening. I shall try not to punish you over severely today.

I have been delighted by some things I have observed in the way of reaction to that work which we have undertaken down in Washington to ascertain what part, if any, the munitions industry plays in keeping upon the door step of the world, day in and day out, a constant threat of war and danger of war. I have been exceedingly delighted in the response which has come from our present friends north of our international boundary. I have been sadly disappointed by a reaction which has been awakened elsewhere, a reaction which at times I have considered rather a madness, a madness whose motive may have been very purposely intended.

I have already apologized for the state of my voice.

I expect there are among you those who think that coming here and joining with you today, I ought to extend an apology for something that occurred in Washington last September, during the course of our hearings under this investigation, yet I cannot apologize for something that didn't occur and consequently, I am not going to apologize. But there has been throughout the world a conclusion drawn that our Investigating Committee took great delight, keen pleasure, in dragging the name of the King into the hearings, and reflecting upon him as having had a hand as a partner with the munitions industry. I have already said that there was no implied charge resting with the Committee when it permitted to become a part of its record and a part of its evidence, letters which among other things, related the contention of one munitions salesman that he was up against terrible competition over in Poland where Vickers had the hand and the help of the King of England in landing orders. There was no implied charge in that but as is our custom in America, in the States, we were forced to make that a part of our records. Had we done anything other than that, we would straightway have been charged with concealing evidence that related directly to the study which was under way. But we here today, I think, need offer no explanation. I think we understand each other, as between Canada and the United States, as well or better than neighbour lands anywhere in the world understand each other. (Applause). I think we understand each other to that extent which enables us to wonder at times what it is that is leading us and this world off on to that insane course which finds us doing things today which sixteen brief years ago we swore fervently we would never do again. It was only sixteen years ago that we raised our faces and our hands Heavenward, and gave thanks for the ending of that terrible struggle for four years that brought little more than wastage and destitution to all civilization.

Yet, we took some pleasure, we took some pride in the thought of the part we had played in the States, the part you had played in the Dominion, in that cause which we delighted to call a war to end war—a war to end war. And yet, here we are today, I think I am free to say, here we are today, nearer more war, having constant threats of more war in a larger degree than was true thirty days before the World War broke upon us. I think the danger of war today is greater than it was thirty days before the World War, and I am not saying that we are only thirty days away from another war, as you will understand. After this experience of sixteen brief years ago, even to contemplate that the world might be in even small part resigned, as it is in large part resigned to another war is quite unbelievable. Here we are, packing the burdens of that war, a burden that has all but broken our back, a burden that is such that it is utterly impossible for some nations to balance budgets and yet, a burden that isn't sufficiently a reminder to us to keep us away from doing those things which in the past have led this world into war.

While we are thus burdened, it is at least interesting to recount what we might do today in these distressing, depressing times, if we had what four years of war cost this world. Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia University in New York, has given us a compilation showing what we could do if we had the cost of that World War today. We could do some exceptionally fine things and among them would be these: We could go into Russia, Italy, Belgium, France, Great Britain, Australia, Canada and the United States and build there homes costing $2,500. apiece. We could furnish those homes with a thousand dollars worth of furniture and give such a home to every family resident in those lands I have named and have enough money left so that every community of 25,000 people or more could have a $2,000,000 library and a $10,000,000 university, and still have a balance which, if we invested a part of it judiciously as to earn a return of five per cent per year, would enable us with that return to pay salaries of $1,000. a year to 125,000 school teachers and to 125,000 more nurses, and we would still have enough money left to go into Germany and Belgium and possess ourselves of every penny's worth of property that exists in those lands today. That could we do if we wanted to do it, if we had what four years of war cost this world.

Yet, instead of letting that war with its cost serve as a lesson, we find the world today madly going forth on a course that clearly has in mind the extreme danger, and the thought of need for explicit preparation for more war. So forcefully are we going forward that even in these days of bankruptcy and unbalanced budgets, this world is finding it possible to spend more money getting ready for more war than it ever spent in peace times before.

It is not my purpose today to charge who might be or who is the leader in this mad competition that finds the world, the nations, battling one another to see which can have the extra ounce of tonnage, to be resorted to in the next engagement in the way of world war. In this world effort, it is only necessary for me to say that every power on earth has increased since 1913, the year before the World War, its budgets for maintenance of armies and navies. Italy, Russia, France and Great Britain have increased their budgets all the way from thirty to forty per cent over that span of years; and I am humbled and saddened to relate to you that my own country, the States, over the same span of years, has increased its budget to maintain armies and navies, one hundred and ninety-seven per cent. And I say I come to you humbly, because we down there for long have liked to consider that we were the leaders in the cause of world peace, in the cause of disarmament. Some day America, and that soon, is going to suddenly awaken to the part that it is playing in this mad competition that is on at this time and when that time comes, I hope that our countries, your country and mine, are going to become, not only in name and claim, but are going to become actual leaders in that cause which looks to understanding among the nations of the world, that is going to save us from the terribleness another war is going to be, (Applause) the hell that another war is going to be.

How are we going to account for our forgetting? How are we going to account for the brief moment we bestow now in memory of those who gave their lives to what they believed was the cause of ending war? I have before me a despatch taken from the New York Herald Tribune of November 12th, a despatch from London, and after I read that despatch I sat down, took my pencil and estimated that if it is true that there are sixty minutes in an hour and twenty-four hours in a day there are approximately five hundred and twenty-five thousand minutes in a year. Now, let me read this despatch from London: "Except for two minutes of silence in tribute to the war dead on Armistice Day today, the Sunday shift at Vickers Works at Crayford, Kent, worked all day long making machine guns, rifles and gas-projecting machines."

And I am not reflecting on Vickers, because what Vickers was doing the other munitions makers of the world were doing, engaged in an intense campaign of producing and selling the machinery of war, the machinery that is being sold to nations in preparation for no nation in particular, but in effect a programme of arming the world against itself, arming the world to a degree which is breaking the very back of every civilization upon the face of this earth.

How are we to account for it? How do we so easily forget the experience of only sixteen years ago? I think today the answer is more evident than it ever was before. The masses of people the world over know most emphatically that there is no such thing as profit for war for them, but there are a few in this world who have come to learn and whose books reveal the proof, that there can be and that there is profit in war and in preparation for war, profit to a point which finds profits flowing most freely when blood flows thickest upon the field of battle.

In my own country, I find the explanation for our short memories in the fact that during the four years of world war, in America alone there were created twenty-two thousand millionaires—men who couldn't have had that wealth except as men were giving and offering their all on the field of battle. Because there is profit in war and in preparation for war, we are constantly threatened by more of it. We are constantly being cautioned to beware of this country and to beware of that country. In my own country, our bugaboo is Japan and while our munitions makers in America are preaching to us the doctrine, "Look out for Japan," over in Japan, the same identical munitions industry is preaching a doctrine to the people of Japan that has them saying, "Look out for Uncle Sam; look out for the United States," all of which is a very profitable foundation for those industries engaged in the manufacture and sale of munitions of war.

And, my good friends up here in Toronto, let me say to you this: In the light of revelations brought forth by reason of our investigation which will be continued, starting on the 3rd of December, I am prepared to say that if we in this world can remove the element, the motive of profit in this thing of providing national defence and in the business of waging war, we will have eliminated well over fifty per cent of the danger of more war in these countries. (Applause.) We are told on every hand, as you are told, that the way to make secure our peace is to prepare for war, and every generation since the beginning of time has listened to that same caution—to make secure your peace, prepare for war. Yet, for every mile of international boundary where there has been adequate preparation for war and where war has been prevented, for every such mile of international boundary, you and I can bring into exhibition a thousand miles of international boundary that never has seen upon it a mounted gun, that never has had on either side of that boundary a patrolling soldier, yet has never been once threatened with any danger of war. You have to the south of you, we have to the north of us, such an imaginary line, approximately twenty-five hundred miles long. Never once has there been a soldier upon that boundary, never once a gun mounted there to provide an adequate national defence for us against you and for you against us. And yet there isn't a soul today who will contend that the absence of an adequate national defence upon that boundary has for one moment jeopardized our relations or made dangerous a threat of a war between our great peoples. And over in my States, at a point common to my state and the Dominion, there has been set aside on each side of that boundary, thousands of acres of mountainous land, rough, lake-ridden land, with streams and vegetation in abundance, that is being created and made by international agreement into a beautiful spot to be known as the "International Peace Garden," commemorating those scores upon scores of years of peace between two great nations without having had upon the boundary at any time, at any stage, anything resembling an adequate preparation for war. (Applause.) A beautiful monument, one which ought to be seen, one whose significance ought to be felt, ultimately, throughout the world.

But the world plugs forward now, day in and day out, taking two minutes out once a year to pay tribute to the memory of the boys who gave their all to the end that there might be an end of war. We take two minutes a year out and all the other remaining five hundred and twenty-five thousand minutes we plunge, as we never plunged before, into the production and sale of armaments, getting ready for the next war! Is there profit in this business of preparing for war? Is there profit in waging war? I am going to inflict upon you a few figures this afternoon. Before I do this, I am going to suggest to you that the next time you come down to the

States, down to New York, you go over and call on Mr. J. P. Morgan. If you find him in and find him with one of his honest days on his hands, he will reveal to you an experience which was his father's back in the early sixties when he read that the American army was about to make an auction sale of 5,000 old and antiquated army muskets. Mr. Morgan sent his men to Washington and bought all those 5,000 muskets, paying for them, $3.50 apiece. He asked if he couldn't keep those in the United States Arsenal until he called for them. That privilege was granted and they stayed in those arsenals for almost a year until Mr. Morgan read that General Freemont was trying to organize an army out in the neighbourhood of St. Louis. He had plenty of men but no guns and couldn't get delivery of guns fast enough, so Mr. Morgan notified General Freemont as to what he had—five thousand rifles in fine condition. "If you want them, you can have them for $23.00 apiece." General Freemont wanted them. When they were despatched to him, he distributed them among his men and they were taken out on the range for practice and trial, where hundreds of men shot off their own thumbs and fingers, in such rotten state of repair was this artillery.

Freemont declined to recommend payment of the bill. A Board was appointed to arbitrate the claim and the Board finally said to Mr. Morgan, "You only paid $3.50 for those guns. They weren't in good repair as you said they were, and you aren't entitled to $23.00 apiece. We have made up our minds you should be content with our award of $13.00 apiece for those guns." And Mr. Morgan said, "Is that so? We will see about that." And to the courts Mr. Morgan went with his claim. After long litigation, the courts held there was a sacredness, a sanctity of contract involved here and Mr. Morgan should have $23.00 apiece for those guns.

Is there profit in preparation for war? Is there profit in war? Let us take a few figures such as I have here before me. I have here a list of fourteen or fifteen American corporations engaged in the production of armaments, munitions of war. In the first column is the name of the company. In the second column, their annual average peace time profit during the four years of peace leading up to the World War. The third column reveals the profits of the same corporations, their average annual profit during four years of war. I will read them fast:

Scovill Manufacturing Company, $655,000. profit annually during four years of peace; $7,678,000 each year during the war. Niles Bemert Powder Company, $656,000, annually in peace time, as compared with $6,146,000 annually, during the war years. Atlas Powder Company, $485,000, annually in peace years, as compared to $2,374,000 annually in war years. Republican Iron and Steel, $4,000,000 in peace time, as against $17,000,000 annually during the four years of war. General Motors, $6,000,000 in peace time, annually, and $21,000,000, annually during the war. Anaconda Copper Company, $10,000,000 in peace time, and an average of $34,000,000 annually during the war. The U. S. Steel Corporation—I don't know whether you have changed the spelling of "steel" here or not; it is still the United States Steel Corporation with us—$105,000,000 in peace time, annually, and $239,000,000, annually, during the four years of war. Bethlehem Steel—they haven't changed their name—they were quite content with $6,000,000 profit during peace years as compared with $49,000,000 annual profit during the four years of war. Dupont, who rushed into the press last June, declaring that the purpose of this investigation authorized by the Senate was that of undermining the national defence of America, and was instigated by Reds and radicals and Communists—I expect if I had been in the Dupont shoes I would have seen red, too, if I saw anyone taking any steps which might in any way destroy the prospects in the future for such handsome returns as was theirs during four years of war—the Dupont annual average profit was $6,000,000 during peace years; during war years, it was $58,000,000. The Duponts enjoyed a return upon their investment over the four years of war, of more than four hundred per cent, while men were giving their all or offering their all, at $30.00 a month and less out in the trenches.

Is there profit in war and in preparation for war? So much of it, my friends, that until we can destroy the motive of profit, we are going to have constant threat of more war.

I have told you that our bugaboo in America is Japan. There is not a chance in the world of any gainful war between those two nations, but we talk it year in and we talk it year out, and if war *should* come between those two countries, our American boys as they move across the Pacific to meet their Japanese foe, are straightway going to be the target of guns, shrapnel and shell, sold to Japan by American munitions makers at a profit. There is no exaggeration there and what our munitions makers in America are doing, my good Canadian friends, your munitions makers and the munitions makers the world over are doing. They are international. They honour particularly and love especially, no particular flag. Their love for the flag depends upon the flow of profits that come from beneath that flag—that, and that alone! The business of manufacturing and selling munitions of war in this world has become nothing short of a racket—a rotten, international racket, and with those engaged in it, racketeers of the first water, racketeers little deserving of the honour some of our lands give and pay to those who engage in that struggle. Why, a man who was nothing more than a successful salesman, a salesman who had learned how to arm every nation against every other nation, with the same identical instruments of warfare, that man back in the years during and following the World War, was honoured by every crowned head in the world and honoured by the President of the United States—Sir Basil Zaranoff, who was nothing more than a successful salesman engaged in the racket of arming the world against itself. Yet, civilization has honoured him and paid tribute to him and decorated him.

I have told you what would happen to us if we went to war with Japan. There is no exaggeration there and I think you people, perhaps, too often have heard of a certain engagement during the World War which found a company of young boys, recruited in a single British community, recruited and sent to the battle front in France and engaged there for days with a company of German soldiery. Many of those British boys laid down their lives in that battle particularly, because the Germans seemed to be possessed of a gun that was unusually efficient and that battle didn't end until the British had captured that gun. With the war over with, they thought how nice it would be if they could drag that gun back to their own British community and have it erected as a monument to the boys who laid down their lives before that gun. Back it went and there it stands today. On one side of the great blazing barrel of that gun, deeply engraved, are the names of the British boys who laid down their lives in that battle. On the other side of the same barrel of the same gun, there remains the engraving of the trademark and the name of the British munitions maker who manufactured and sold that gun to Germany. A monument? O, what a monument! Yet a monument great, it could be, if only its significance could be permitted to sink into the minds of civilization today.

(Applause.)

I have told you that this international band of munitions makers and racketeers acknowledges no flag, plays alike with all customers, all who will be their customers. The investigation has revealed that they spend young fortunes annually, maintaining expensive lobbies in the capitals of the world. They put aside large sums of money to bribe—I said BRIBE—to bribe public officials with and to pay handsome commissions to men who stand close to the public officials in this country, that and the other, those public officials who are looked to to negotiate purchases for their governments of munitions of war, and the investigation has clearly revealed and established beyond a shadow of a doubt, that the munitions industry actually engages in creating war scares. pitting one people and one nation against another and fanning a scare into a hatred and a deep fear that makes a fine market for the munitions of war, and then, getting them actually to war and into trouble, keeps them there just as long as it can because that is a profitable state of affairs for the munitions industry.

Why, we had the example of one salesman for an American munitions maker who had been transferred a few years ago from South America to Cuba to supply the needs of the Cuban rebels who were trying to overthrow the Cuban government, and his employers paid this salesman a very handsome commission for all such sales as he made and he made many. Then they paid him a little higher commission for the sales of the same supplies that he would make to the Cuban government which was trying to put down and quell these rebels and rebellions.

The last minute that the salesman was on the stand and under oath before us, I couldn't refrain from asking him if there weren't moments when his conscience bothered him a little bit, if there weren't times when he wished he were in some other business and he couldn't remember that his conscience had ever bothered him. We had to remind him of a letter he had written to another munitions salesman on the day after Christmas last year. Permit me to read three lines: "We are certainly in one hell of a business, where a fellow has to wish for trouble so as to make a living, the only consolation being that if we didn't get the business, somebody else would. It would be a terrible state of affairs if my conscience started bothering me right now."

A hell of a business, the business of bringing hell on this earth, just as fast as they know how to bring it! There is a little consolation in finding that even at moments, those engaged in that traffic of arms do have a little prickly sensation around that thing we call conscience.

The investigation has revealed that the munitions industry doesn't worry especially when its country writes an embargo against the shipment of arms to another country because all they do is notify their partners in the international racket, their partners across the Atlantic: "You take this field; we have to keep out for the moment." They share profits; they share territory and they divide the territory of the world. "You take this; I will take that. You take that country, I will take this," and then they share in the profits.

Why, do you understand, do you realize that after the World War, the Electric Boat Company of Croton, Connecticut, manufacturers of submarines, sued the government of Germany—sued them for what? The damage German submarines had done to us during the war? No, sued Germany to collect royalties on the submarines Germany had built on the patents, plans, specifications and designs, owned exclusively by the Electric Boat Company of Croton, Conn.

We wonder why we get nowhere in Disarmament conferences, yet, if you will but read records of the investigation you will find there the stories of the letters written by delegates to the Disarmament Conferences to the munition makers, telling them not to worry about what that Conference is going to do.

My good friends, until we can accomplish one lone Disarmament Conference that is divorced from those who represent or speak the language of munitions makers, until we can have one conference divorced from the men, the generals and the admirals whose training from the cradle up has been the training of acceptance of these preparedness programmes, until we can have one such conference, we are going to get nowhere in this Disarmament effort. (Applause.)

All over the world, American munitions makers, British munitions makers, French munitions makers, all over this world they are selling the right to manufacture this instrument of war, that instrument of war, that kind of shell, this kind of shrapnel, to those nations which so far, are likely to be the foes in another war. There is no secrecy any more of patents, of designs, of plans of the munitions one nation is going to use against another in another war.

But the saddest part to me about all the revelations is that showing so clearly who the best partner, who the best friend of the munitions maker is. Invariably, in every land, in every home of the munitions maker, its best friend and its partner is the government. And I say that without fear of contradiction.

Down in Peru some few years ago the munitions makers convinced the Peruvian government that they didn't have an adequate national defence and Peru asked Uncle Sam to give them a hand and Uncle Sam appointed a commission of naval experts who went down and helped Peru plan a so-called adequate national defence and included among their recommendations was this, that Peru should buy a fleet of submarines which didn't cause any tears in the Electric Boat Company's plant at Croton, Connecticut.

But when Peru got her delivery of submarines, she went on parade in her harbour waters and Columbia was watching the parade day after day, and it suddenly dawned on Peru's neighbour, Columbia, that she didn't have an adequate national defence to cope with Peru's submarines. And Columbia appealed to Uncle Sam for a little expert advice and Uncle Sam sent to Columbia another commission of naval experts to help them plan an adequate defence against Peru's submarines, and as Uncle Sam had recommended only two years before that Peru buy a fleet of submarines, the same recommendation was made to Columbia. One of these days we are going to send a few American submarines down to straighten out the trouble between those two countries, a trouble that no one is more responsible for than the American munitions makers, working in partnership with their government of the United States of America.

In 1928, we down in the States, equipped a few of our battle fleet with a brand new type of naval gun that gave us superior advantage and the producer of that gun immediately went to Europe to sell the same gun over there. They weren't very successful. They couldn't tote along with them a gun weighing hundreds of pounds—yes, tons. They had no sample and they weren't doing any business. They went to Turkey and tried to sell the gun there. 'Nothing doing'! I like to conceive the state of mind they were in—so depressed. And here they sit upon the docks at the port of Constantinople one day, kicking their heels against the posts, these salesmen. On one side of them sat the Minister of War of Turkey; on the other side sat the Admirals and the Generals of the army of Turkey. While they sat there, deploring the fact that they couldn't do business, they didn't have anything to demonstrate this new gun with. What happened? There arrived in the harbour, the beautiful battle ship, "Rawleigh." It drops anchor and on board go the salesman with the Turkish officials and our American sailor boys kindly demonstrate the gun and Mr. Griggs, the producer, writes out an order for eight guns for the Turkish navy, maybe to be used against us some day.

Partnership? Why, so hard and fast a partnership that it cannot be denied. And, understand, my friends, what is true down in the States is equally true in every other land which entertains the manufacture of armaments.

It seems to me there is but one way to conquer this thing, this mad race leading us to that inevitable thing we call war. That is to destroy absolutely any possibility for private profit to be made from this thing we call national defence, (applause) and the one way to do that is for the governments of the world to exercise a hard and fast and absolute monopoly in the production of the primary instruments of national defence, putting out of business the private industry as respects ship building, as respects aeroplane making, as respects the manufacture of guns and of ammunition, and some chemicals. Not all down the line, not everything that is called a munition of war need be included, but take those bigger, those more principal items and make the governments the sole and exclusive producers, providing a national defence for their own country, not a national defence for all the world, but for their own country. Destroy the element of profit and you will find larger prospects for success in disarmament conferences.

There is one other thing every civilization ought to do and do quickly. Take the prospect of there ever being profits for anyone in any war and destroy that prospect. Do it how? Why, we all have income tax laws. You have them; we have them; Britain has them. Let us write income tax laws today, in times of peace, declaring that in the event of the declaration of war by our countries, there shall automatically become effective, new rates of income taxation, that incomes, let us say, up to $10,000 a year shall be subject to a doubling in the rate of taxation and that all incomes in excess of $10,000 a year shall be subject to an income tax of ninety-eight or ninety-nine per cent. Do you realize what would be accomplished? Why, there would be decreases in the numbers of those in that army who today are saying that maybe the way to accomplish recovery and economic balance again is to have another little war. You hear it; you have heard it, as I have. Do that and watch the numbers grow in this army of men and women who will fight to the last ditch and resort to anything that is honourable before being dragged into another war. Do those things and watch vanish the great danger of more war, the large percentage of danger of more war. Do that, my friends, and observe a pleasant departure of those who make profits in war, paying for the war while the war is being engaged in, not shouldering the burden upon the backs of unborn generations, but making those responsible for the war pay for it. If we do that—O, but someone says, "That is delightful to contemplate, but aren't you aware of the fact that there are hundreds, yes, thousands of people who are accustomed to incomes of more than ten thousand dollars a year to meet the expense of maintaining their families and their estate?" Yes, I am aware of it. And I am also aware of the fact that the boys who are giving their all in the trenches and on the battle field during the war are accustomed to better things than they are finding there and in the event of more war, let civilization look to one and all to share equally and to sacrifice equally in the winning of that war for their country and for their flag.

If we would do those things we would serve ourselves and serve future generations in no small degree. You can have your issues, call them what they are, but there is not an issue confronting civilization today, political or economic, that doesn't trace directly or indirectly to that four years of war, and if we would avoid more of it, we would devote ourselves to this greatest of all great issues, the elimination of profit and of prospective profit in more war. And were we to do that, we would not only be serving ourselves and saving ourselves from the humility and terribleness of another war, we would be serving those boys and girls who are ours and those unborn boys and girls who are to follow them. We will be serving them as any good citizen of today ought to be willing to serve, irrespective of the direct benefit to himself. We ought, whether we can help ourselves immediately or not, we ought to be looking ahead to that day when we want others coming after us to enjoy a lifetime, free from the constant threat, the constant danger, and the actual war that does come to nearly every generation. Let us then be bridge builders like the old man in the poem:—

That old gray man, travelling a lone highway.
Came at evening, cold and gray,
To a chasm, deep and wide.
The old man paused in the twilight dim;

The sullen stream held no fear for him,
But he turned when he reached the other side,
And he builded a bridge to span that tide.
"Old man," cried a fellow pilgrim near,
"You are wasting your strength with building here.
"Your journey will end this ending day,
"And you, never again, will pass this way.
"You have crossed the chasm, deep and wide,
"Why build you a bridge to the other side?"

And the builder raised his old gray head,
"Good friend, on the path I have come," he said,
"There followeth after me today,
"A youth whose feet must pass this way.
"This stream which has been as naught to me,
"To this fair youth may a pitfall be.
"He, too, must cross in the twilight dim,
"Good friend, I am building this bridge for him."

Thank you, Gentlemen, for your delightful attention. (Prolonged applause).

FOUR NATIONS

AN ADDRESS BY COLONEL CHARLES MORROW

November 22, 1934.

The guest speaker, COLONEL CHARLES MORROW, Commandant of Old Fort Niagara, New York, was introduced by the President of The Empire Club, MR. DANA PORTER.

MR. DANA PORTER: It is particularly appropriate today that we have with us as our guest, Colonel Morrow, the Commandant of Old Fort Niagara in New York State and that we are also in a position to welcome as our guests, the members of the different teams who are appearing at the Royal Winter Fair, (Applause) and, along with them, Lord Dorchester, who is sitting at my left. (Applause).

Old Fort Niagara is an emblem not only of a long period of peace in the past but is an emblem of what we may hope to attain in the future. It is also a significant thing that peace is only eventually brought about by a struggle because it is a fortress, an old fortress which would be so hopelessly inadequate today for any purpose, either of defence or offence in the way of warfare. The very appearance of it signifies how obsolete warfare is on this continent. (Applause).

It was by some happy stroke that Colonel Morrow was appointed as Commandant for that fort, because Colonel Morrow is not only a soldier but he has a peculiar capacity of being able to express himself in words which, very often soldiers say they are unable to do, and he brings to us an example of that mellow culture of Kentucky for which we have a warm place in our hearts. It is with very great pleasure that I call on Colonel Morrow.

COLONEL CHARLES MORROW: Mr. Toastmaster, Lord Dorchester, my friends of The Empire Club of Canada: I think I can say, 'my friends' (Applause) because the last time I had the pleasure of meeting the Empire Club and its representatives was when The Empire Club's national meeting occurred in Canada and Earl Jellicoe and his most distinguished party were entertained at Old Fort Niagara.

More than that, to this particular gathering in this particular city and part of our continent, I come as one who at least has been charmed and enraptured with the colour and the greatness of the history that has been made on this frontier, because surely the history of Upper Canada and Western New York holds in its memory the valourous deeds of great soldiers, the chant of martyred priests, the screaming war cry of Seneca and Mohawk, the soothing lullaby of a pioneer mother singing a babe to sleep before her stone cabin fires, the ringing sound of a woodsman's axe, the crack of a soldier's rifle, fire and sword—raid and plunder. And then, the strength of primal things, the turning of the forest, the strength that comes out of the new born earth, the building of log homes, the beauty and glory of orchards in bloom, the magic of new vines joining hands, villages and hamlets growing into roaring cities—then, light, power and splendour, as man harnessed the great Falls to serve his purposes and through the genius of wondrous engineering built great canals to bear the commerce of an inland empire.

Surely the history of this part of North America is one of the greatest epic dramas of this continent. (Applause).

Late in the sixteenth century there came to that point where the restless Niagara River flashes into the sapphire sea of Ontario, one of France's bravest and best, Robert Rene Cavalier De La Salle, in 1678, to build there the first rude palisade of a fort and with that as a base began his forward voyage, first down the Ohio, later through the Great Lakes on to the mighty Father of Waters, the Mississippi, to come at last on a sunlit land which he called Louisiana in honour of Louis, the sun King of France. And his amazed eyes beheld in wonder the rippling waters of the Atlantic—the Gulf of Mexico. La Salle had traversed Mid-America.

Wherever he went he raised cairns of stone, carved in timbers, buried in lead, the arms of France—France's claim to hold Mid-America, the great valleys of the Ohio, the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Arkansas and the Red—an empire greater than any king in Europe had ever reigned over.

To make her title clear, France sent to this New World, no weaklings. She sent the bravest and the best of her great French blood.

To challenge that claim came England's colonies from the bleak shores of the Atlantic—thirteen colonies to challenge France's claim to Mid-America. Through that challenge there came those wars which drenched this continent in blood for more than a hundred years.

Early in the beginning of the seventeenth century the high command of France had determined to exclude the English from Mid-America and to carry that policy into execution they built mightily and with great military vision. Coming up the St. Lawrence they seized Montreal and built there a fort and coming on up the lake they built Fort Niagara to control the great portage around the great cataract of Niagara, as strategic in that day as the Welland Canal is today, since it gave control and a water route between Erie and Ontario and a gateway to the western world.

With consummate skill they built Venango and Le Beouf on the Alleghany; they built great Duquesne where Pittsburgh now stands to give control of the mighty reaches of the Ohio Valley, and coming on there arose the forts at Detroit to control the entrance between Erie and Huron, and with matchless skill and precision they built Mackinac to control the entrance to Lake Michigan, and St. Ignace and St. Marie to control the entrance to Superior. Then coming across it, they built the portage forts to control the Illinois—they built Vincennes on the Wabash, and as the crowning triumph they built Kaskaskia and Chehoka to cover the Mississippi.

And France, from the strong rock of Quebec on to New Orleans, controlled Mid-America by the chain of mighty forts.

To break that chain, the English colonies sent across five mountain ranges one English Major, George Washington to meet defeat and disaster at the hands of the French and to surrender Fort Necessity. You will pardon me, Gentlemen, if I say that that was the only surrender of George Washington. And then there came after that disaster, fire and sword between the English colonies and the French, between the French's mighty unit of command the English with their ten independent colonies governed by thirteen loyal and wonderful governors, with only one fly in that ointment—all of those thirteen governors were terrifically and everlastingly determined that they would not agree on anything save the general proposition to disagree.

Then the lightning rapier fighters of France struck here and there. Schenectady was in flames; Northern New York knew fire and sword and Pennsylvania was helpless. Everywhere there was disaster and the call went out from those English colonies to the Mother Country, "Save us or we perish."

And England answered the call, as England has always answered the call of her children. (Applause). She sent to this continent the 40th, the 41st, the 44th and the 46th, and the great Grenadier Regiment of Scotland, the great Black Watch, itself. She sent General Braddock, the greatest captain of his day and she sent with him an army that had been victorious on many stricken fields of Europe. Braddock with that army of men marched across those five mountain ranges to strike at French power in the valley of the Ohio, to strike at Duquesne.

But, alas, the smooth battlefields of Europe were not the American wilderness. The plan of campaign had been planned by the great Duke of Cumberland, sitting in London and he knew as little of the American wilderness as I know concerning the canals on Mars. Braddock marched gallantly and courageously but he was to meet on this continent one of the greatest foemen that ever soldier met. He was to meet in the American wilderness the American Indian who, on his chosen ground, in his own domain, was the equal of any soldier of his time. Braddock went down to one of the worst disastrous defeats ever sustained by English arms; he went down fighting with his British regulars and the American colonials fighting with him. When he died, he almost died in the arms of one of his aide-de-camps, the other two having been wounded—yea, in the arms of that same Major Washington who had surrendered Fort Necessity.

And that war continued with disaster everywhere-- Fort Oswego and Fort Henry falling before the prowess of Montcalm, the Black Watch of Scotland storming at Ticonderoga and going down to defeat, disastrous and terrible, and yet a defeat which covered them with honour and in glory.

It is little known, perhaps, that the Black Watch of Scotland, from that disastrous defeat, still has as its battle cry that word which to them that day was one of defeat and disaster but which has lived in glory in their annals and traditions. When the Black Watch of Scotland went to Germany and went up against the German line, the cry went out from the Black Watch—Ticonderoga! Ticonderoga! Great in their history and great in our history!

And then there came a change. The flag of France held. There was only one battle won—the battle of Lake George by Sir William Johnson, the great American colonial. Then there came the attack on that keypoint of all France's power, Old Niagara, almost on our border here. If that chain of forts could be broken, France's power was broken in Mid-America.

They came by a water route, the three great British regular regiments and two regiments of English American colonials, one regiment from the province of Northern New York and one from the colony of Massachussetts, to strike at Niagara under the command of General Prideaux, to wrest that stern old fort, wrest that queen of the inland waterways from the French and to draw their lines tighter and tighter around it; and as they paralleled and zigzagged and approached it, the thunder of their guns shook its foundation, though it was defended magnificently behind its battlements by the great French engineer who had built it, Captain Francois Puchot.

Then, from the west there came Captain Aubrey and Captain Francois De Lignery, rallying the French through all those scattered western forts—Venango, Le Boeuf, Mackinac and Detroit—their French regulars and bringing also the Western Indians, to come up the shores of Erie to land above the Falls of Niagara, and to come on with that great relieving body to relieve Captain Puchot and the French who fought behind Niagara's walls.

The western Indians, hundreds of them, had been in the disasters sustained by Braddock's arms, and they had been taught by the French through that victory that the English were easily defeated.

General Prideaux had been killed early in the seige by the premature explosion of a small cohorn and this left the English command to Sir William Johnson. Johnson drew his forces up with the right flank resting along the great gorge of the Niagara and extending eastward, the English position was covered by Colonel Butler with the great Mohawks to intercept that relieving body.

The French came on boldly, believing that victory was within their grasp, to be met by the Black Watch of Scotland in battle array and to hear the terrible war cry of Seneca and Mohawk go up, and to watch the western Indians falling before an enemy they had never been able to defeat. And when that battle was over, that French army was destroyed, dead or in captivity, and the next day, the flag of France came down from above Old Fort Niagara and the Union Jack of England went up, and on this stricken field of La Belle Famille had been almost decided the most momentous question of this continent—that this continent should be all English, not half French and half English.

Then, the western forts fell, one after another, like a house of cards. Montcalm was denied that reinforcement and support from the west which, had it been able to have joined him, there might have been a different story on the fields of Abraham, where Montcalm died and the illustrious Wolfe conquered.

And the Pompadour said to Louis in France, "O' Louis, why do you withdraw your smile from us? Why, you have lost nothing in America. There are there but some barren acres of snow and ice." Barren acres of snow and ice? They lost an empire greater than any Bourbon king was ever to reign over.

Then there came that War of the Revolution which, in many of its aspects, was a civil war. It divided families, broke up life-long friendships and more especially in this western part from New York it smote very heavily. Niagara remained always in the hands of the English. Then there came the fighting in the villages of the Cherry Valley; when neighbours fought old neighbours; there came the fighting in the valley of the Wyoming—fire and sword; there came Oriskany, when reinforcements were denied to Burgoyne and the Iroquois Confederacy was dealt a blow from which it never recovered. Finally, that war coming to its conclusion left Niagara still in the hands of England.

Then came the Treaty of 1783, the Treaty of Paris. From the time of that Treaty, in 1783 to 1786, there was a period which came to be what we call in our history, "the hold over period", England holding in the American territory, Fort Oswego, Fort Niagara, Fort Detroit and Fort Mackinac.

It was during those years that Canada received that great population which gave her upward movement, a terrific colonizing movement, perhaps unequalled in the stories of this continent. The great ancestor of His Lordship, General Carlton, in his evacuation of the British army from the City of New York, brought not only the weary and footsore regiments of George the Second, to Canada, but he brought 25,000 American Loyalists—Loyalists who, through all those seven years of fighting had stood loyally by their King. (Applause).

There came to Upper Canada in that day a great soldier and a great statesman, John Graves Simcoe to become the first Governor, and through Old Niagara there streamed 10,000 American Loyalists, as highly educated, as charming and as fine people as England had ever sent to her colonies in this country, breaking up their homes, their all having been taken from them, breaking up the friendships and the ties of years, severing families and friends, the one from the other. They came from old New England, they came from Philadelphia, from Boston, from the city of New York, by waggon and team and by oxen and migrated north of them, ten thousand of them sweeping through Western New York to cross under the shelter of Old Niagara's guns to become your wonderful pioneers of Upper Canada.

Surely, in that movement and as a result of that War, Canada owes much to those earlier settlers of the English colonies on the Atlantic seaboard. They brought with them their traditions of that day, of the early settlement of those that had gone before them, a great part having fought together for a hundred years against the French, having fought each other. And they came here, those pioneers, those of English stock, the same stock as the people they left back behind them—surely the same great stock.

And then there came those years when the English race moved mightily forward, especially in the lower part of this continent. The English and Irish and Scotch were not to be denied. They went north of the Ohio—blood and tears?—yes, they bled for every acre north of the Ohio. We left more men as we met defeat at Newark than Braddock lost before he came to this continent, and that defeat was not half over when St. Clair met disastrous defeat on the Miami. O, the English, Scotch and Irish paid in wealth for the land of the Ohio.

Then Wayne came to win the battle and the English sent the Royal Artillery to protect those fleeing Indians from the wrath of Wayne.

Time and again in the years between 1783 and 1812, the infant government of America and the beginnings of government in Canada were almost on the point of war and, finally, that war broke, inevitable, unfortunate and terrible, that war broke on this frontier and this frontier bore the brunt as did the frontier of Western New York. Lundy's Lane, Queenston, Chippewa—the attack and sortie at Fort Erie—surely they stand high in the records of valour that are common history of the war on both sides.

Then there came peace to bless this frontier and in 1817, there was executed that greatest of all treaties and agreements, the Rush-Bagot Treaty, which disarmed a frontier 2,600 miles long and took from the Great Lakes the haunting fear of great grim fighting ships and left it to commerce to bear the rich argosies of the trade of an inland empire—the shortest, clearest and cleanest of all international agreements, the Rush-Bagot Treaty stands as a monument to the common sense of the English-speaking nations of this continent. (Applause).

And then the decks having been cleared by war, the English owned this continent and began its exploration and began its conquest, the relentless, marvellous movement to the west.

There was a great movement a thousand years before Christ was born when the Goths and the Huns and the Vandals came across Europe. It was a great, a marvellous thing. But those great marches never compared in any feature with the conquest of the North American continent by the English-speaking race. Two thousand miles we went to reach the shores of the Pacific—the greatest march—hundreds and hundreds of waggon trains, their covered waggons, men, women and children, marching with their belongings tied to the waggons, across three great mountain ranges and those mountain ranges were tipped with snow, to cross the great American desert, and destiny marched before them as it marched with them and they covered those great routes with their dead. But there were births, too, in those great caravans—life was coming to complete the cycle. A great waggon train was drawn at night into a circle, and the songs of those marching men and those wonderfully courageous women, those songs were going back into the spiritual things of a deep life. They marched over roads that had never been laid out by any engineer, had never been surveyed. It was not done by government; it was done by people marching with Democracy for their leader and in their souls the burning hope of tremendous opportunity in a free world.

So they marched up the Peace River on your side up to the Fraser, down the Saskatchewan to the great Columbia. They marched on our side toward Oregon, down the Walla-Walla, advancing to come into the Valley of the Columbia—haggard, hungry, shoeless, hatless, covered with furs and bear skins, yet they carried on over each mile, those columns closing up, those cavalcades moving forward, until they reached the shores of the Pacific. And there went they who had known a thousand camp fires; they knew the glorious light that came from cabin homes and the American Continent was conquered.

Some day that song may be sung; some day that picture may be painted. But it requires one as great as Wagner to write the magic chords of that song; or one with the magic brush of a Raphael to paint that picture.

But after all is said and done, the scars of our wars have been obliterated by kindly, generous actions. Time has smoothed out war's wrinkled front, the prejudices and the passions of the past. There remains for you, on this side, the wonderful leadership of Brock, the dauntless courage of Drummond. You will not deny to us, I am sure, our admiration for our great Admiral Perry, (applause) or our devotion to Scott, Brown and Porter. And if you, in Canada, love your heroine, Laura Secord, we love our American heroine, Fanny Doyle.

When all is said, when all is written, there remains but one great thought and one great and everlasting truth: We, of today, are the inheritors through the genius, the courage and the endurance of a common ancestry, of this, the richest land in all the circle of the sun. We are not only the material inheritors, we are the spiritual inheritors and that inheritance should keep us knit close together in the kingdom of the mind, keep us close neighbours and good friends, teach us friendliness and teach us helpfulness and all of this, in order that the English on this continent shall march ever forward to their manifest destiny and that English tradition and English Democracy shall not depart from this land nor perish from this earth. (Hearty applause).

Mr. Dana Porter: Colonel Morrow, the applause of the members of this Club is the best testimony of the interest and enjoyment they have had in listening to your eloquent address. You have painted a most vivid picture of our vivid past and I might almost say that the song which you mentioned, for us has already been sung; and I might also say that the picture you say you await for, has for us already been painted. (Applause).

EXPLORERS AND THE BRITISH EMPIRE

AN ADDRESS BY BRIGADIER GENERAL SIR PERCY SYKES, K.C.I.E., C.B., C.M.G.

November 29, 1934.

The regular luncheon meeting of The Empire Club of Canada was held on Thursday, November 29, 1934, with the President, Mr. Dana Porter, in the Chair.

Following the drinking of toasts to the King and to the newly married Duke and Duchess of Kent, the following resolution was moved by Mr. Featherstonaugh, seconded by Mr. Gale, THAT The Empire Club of Canada forward a cable to the Duke and Duchess of Kent, expressing the good wishes of the Club on the occasion of their marriage. Carried unanimously.

MR. DANA PORTER: Your Grace, and Gentlemen: During the Great War the attention of the world was so focussed upon the Western Front that at that time little was known generally of the happenings of the British forces in Persia. Our guest today, Sir Percy Sykes, was in command of those forces and as we know, was successful. The success of the British forces in Persia was one of those incalculables which had a much greater effect, perhaps, upon the winning of the war, and also upon the unity of the British Empire than the actual numbers of the forces engaged and the news value of those activities at the time might have indicated.

Sir Percy Sykes is a Gold Medallist of the Royal Geographical Society, and a Gold Medallist of the Royal Empire Society, and he also has won a gold medal, known as the MacGregor Memorial Gold Medal for special war service.

It is a great privilege to have Sir Percy Sykes with us today and we are very much indebted to the National Council of Education for bringing Sir Percy to Toronto. It is with great pleasure that I introduce Sir Percy Sykes.

SIR PERCY SYKES, K.C.I.E., C.B., C.M.G.: Mr. Chairman, Your Grace, and Gentlemen: The Roman Empire and the medieval world centred round the Mediterranean Sea. Suddenly, a few years before the close of the fifteenth century, by the practically simultaneous discovery of the ocean route to India and of the immense New World that lay beyond the Atlantic, Europe burst the shackles of the Middle Ages and, mainly through her development of sea power, gradually evolved the might, the wealth and the civilization of the present day. These events dwarf all others in world history.

In 1492, Columbus discovered the New World, albeit he never realized it. Upon his return to Spain, negotiations with Portugal were initiated which culminated in the Treaty of Tordesillas, by which the two Powers divided the world especially the ocean routes outside Europe, between them and among the most important articles of that Treaty of Tordesillas, as it is termed, was one which threatened death to all interlopers.

Such was the position when our ancestors decided to start exploring. Bristol had traded with Portugal and Spain for many centuries and also with Iceland, and thus possessed experienced seamen. When John Cabot, the Venetian navigator settled at Bristol, at some date before 1490, he succeeded in interesting its merchants in his scheme of exploration in the New World. Henry VII was approached and he issued a patent for the discovery of "heathen islands or countries, hitherto unknown to Christians," with the proviso that such discoveries must be made in the latitude of England., that being the area he intended to stake out.

Cabot sailed on his great expedition on May 2, 1497.

The voyage across the Atlantic took fifty-four days and he finally struck Cape Breton. Like Columbus and other explorers of the period, he was convinced that he had reached the coast of Asia and he thought he had struck somewhere on the north of China. He sailed southwards along the coast across the Bay of Fundy to Maine. During the homeward voyage, Newfoundland, our first colony, was sighted but not explored and Cabot finally reached Bristol safely, having made most important discoveries, including that of the cod fisheries.

In his second voyage, undertaken in the following year, Cabot, probably reached the mouth of the Delaware River, but his supporters obsessed with the quest for the Spice Islands, were bitterly disappointed at the failure of the expedition to show any commercial results and, consequently, the venture was abandoned.

Forty years passed and no attempt was made to follow up the discoveries of Cabot, although the cod fisheries were regularly visited by French, Spanish, English and Portuguese vessels but, in 1534, Jacques Cartier sailed from St. Malo, to discover a new route to China. He struck Newfoundland, sailed through the Belle Isle Strait and examined the coast of Labrador. He attempted to sail up the St. Lawrence but the tides ran so strong that the vessels only lost way. Consequently, satisfied with the results of his first voyage, he returned home to report.

On the following year he ascended the St. Lawrence to Stadacona, the site of Quebec, and to Hochelaga, where Montreal was subsequently to be built. Here, I am on ground you know much better than I do. It is noteworthy that both Cabot and Jacques Cartier were bound for the Spice Islands and that while Cabot discovered cod, and Cartier found furs, in neither case was the quest followed up.

My interest in Jacques Cartier is deep. I happen to own a villa at St. Briac, a few miles from St. Malo and before starting for Canada I visited the cathedral where Jacques Cartier was blessed by the Bishop before starting on his voyage. The exact spot is marked by a mosaic, presented to the cathedral by the late Honourable Mercier, who was Premier of Quebec, and is dated 1891.

Some sixty years later, Champlain appeared on the scene and founded Quebec in 1608. He was thus the founder of this great Dominion. The explorers of this period include La Salle whose greatest exploit was the descent of the mightly Mississippi to the ocean, and I understand that the La Chine rapids, which were discovered and given the name included the word "Chine" or "China", is evidence that the quest of China was still the great quest of all European nations. The quest for China remained until the end of the seventeenth century, a great obsession.

Among the leading explorers of Canada at this period were the heroic Jesuit fathers. Other eminent explorers were the fur-traders of the North. Greatest among them was Alexander Mackenzie who, in 1789, determined to discover whether the waters of the Great Slave Lake reached the Arctic or the Pacific Ocean. As you all know, he descended the river subsequently called by his name, for a thousand miles and thus performed one great exploit, but his greatest feat was undertaken in 1792. Making his way up the Peace River he constructed a fort and halted for the winter. In the spring he crossed the Rocky Mountains, floated down the Fraser River for some distance and finally reached the Pacific Ocean by the Bella Coola River. In spite of Indian hostility, he took his observations and then mixing some vermilion, he painted on the rocks: "Alexander Mackenzie, from Canada, by land, the twenty-second of July one thousand seven hundred and ninety-three."

It remains to add that Captain Bishop, a leading explorer of British Columbia has recently not only followed in Mackenzie's track but has checked his observations. He has fixed the famous rock at Edward Point at the entrance to Elcho Harbour and states that Mackenzie, writing his book some years later, confused it with Point Menzies. I may say that I have written a History of Exploration and I made this mistake but I am in good company as the author of the book made it first. Captain Bishop's identification has been accepted, the immortal inscription has been cut on the rock, which has been photographed and a memorial stone has been erected. Perhaps, when prosperity returns to Canada, as it assuredly will, a statue to Alexander Mackenzie will be erected in Canada.

The exploration of the Arctic by the English in the sixteenth century was undertaken with a view to reaching China where it was hoped to find a market for English broadcloth, our only export, practically, and without incurring the danger of breaking the monopoly of the southern ocean routes, and being put to death simply as an interloper by the first Spanish or Portuguese ship that was met with. In 1553, Sir Hugh Willoughby and Richard Chancellor sailed to discover the north-east passage. Willoughby and his crew died of cold on the coast of Lapland. The ship was finally brought back and it was found that every one was frozen to death. Chancelor finding his way into the White Sea, was more fortunate, and landing at Archangel, he went by sled to the court of Ivan, the Terrible, at Moscow, who received him very well and he opened up a most profitable trade in marine products, tallow and timber, between England and Russia. Apart from this success our heroic sea-captains were unable to penetrate further east than the River Ob, and so the quest was abandoned.

Attempts to find the North-West Passage were made by Frobisher and by Davis. Hudson made the great discovery of the bay called after him which now forms part of the Dominion of Canada and Baffin, sailing farther north than his predecessors, discovered Lancaster Sound in 1616. The quest for both passages failed, but these great English navigators had marked out the routes which, some two centuries later, led to final success. They had failed, but failed gloriously.

During this period the power of Spain and Portugal was waning and in 1580, lion-hearted Drake, sailed through Magellan Straits into the Pacific. There he won great booty from the Spaniards and crossing the great Ocean to the Spice Islands he loaded a valuable cargo with which he reached Plymouth safely, after circumnavigating the world.

Eight years later, the Spanish Armada was defeated. That broke down the monstrous monopoly of the southern ocean routes claimed by Spain and Portugal. Our ancestors despatched expeditions to the Spice Islands but at first with scant success. The Dutch were more fortunate. Supported by the entire strength of their Government they drove out the Portuguese and established themselves in the Spice Islands. They then created a monopoly in pepper with the result that its price suddenly rose in the London market from three to eight shillings per pound. This was too much for our sluggish ancestors and brought them into action. They petitioned Queen Elizabeth who granted them a royal charter which led in due course to the Empire of India.

Our pioneers, Newbery and Fitch had previously reached India by Aleppo and the Persian Gulf. Did not the first witch in Macbeth say, "Her husband's to Aleppo gone, master of the Tiger?" Shakespeare evidently thought that Aleppo was a port. In 1601, Lancaster in a second voyage secured a rich cargo of pepper at Bantam, while Hawkins landed at Surat and travelled inland to the court of the Emperor Jahangir. This early period culminated in the capture of the island emporium of Hormuz from the Portuguese in 1622. We captured that fort and it was a very fine achievement and that was the first great feat of English arms in eastern waters. That dated our prestige and we finally, through our sea power defeated all comers and we won the Empire of India.

We now turn to the epoch of Captain Cook, who first won distinction as a surveyor of the St. Lawrence. In 1768, he sailed from England to observe the transit of Venus and to explore the Pacific for the Southern Continent, the existence of which the ancient geographers had assumed as the necessary counterpoise to the Arctic land masses. Cook completely disproved this theory but of far greater practical importance, was his survey of the Coast of the two islands of New Zealand, and of the eastern and northern coast of Australia. Our greatest navigator was a great empire builder. Anchoring on Botany Bay, he says, "as soon as we approached the rocks, two men came down each armed with a lance to dispute our landing"—two naked savages. Cook, whose humanity was exceptional for the period fired a charge of small shot at them which put them to flight, without any blood shed, and this dramatic landing took place. There is a very fine picture of it in the collection of pictures at Melbourne. Cook also charted the Pacific coast of Canada and reached latitude 70 on the northern coast of Alaska, which he suitably named Icy Cape. To quote from the inscription on the base of his statute in London: "He laid the foundations of the British Empire in Australia and New Zealand; he charted the shores of Newfoundland and traversed the Ocean Gates of Canada both East and West." A very fine inscription.

The successor of Captain Cook was Vancouver, who had taken part in his third voyage. Sailing from England in 1791, he struck the south-west coast of Australia, which he carefully surveyed. He then sailed to the west coast of America and spent three seasons in surveying it from 39 deg. of latitude northward and was able to report: "I trust that the survey will set aside every opinion of a North West Passage."

I may say he also settled another question and I heard a good deal about it from Captain Bishop, who has read all the documents. It appears the Spaniards had arrived and turned out the British whom they ill-treated and

Pitt, when he heard of it—I suppose a year or two later—told them they must not only pay an indemnity but they must apologize and they weren't keen on doing it. So he brought into exhibition the greatest English Fleet ever brought into exhibition and was supported by fourteen Dutch ships. The Spaniards decided to evacuate and thereby conceded the western Pacific Ocean, too. I never realized its very great importance before.

The successor of Cook in Australia was Flinders who circumnavigated Tasmania in 1798 and then explored the coast of what is now Victoria, and which he thought was a peninsula. Cook sent one of his captains to find out but he was beaten back by adverse winds, so it was still believed to be a peninsula in Flinders' time. In 1803 he completed the circumnavigation of Australia.

The first great land explorer of Australia was Stuart who, in 1828, discovered the Darling River. In the following year he launched a boat on the Murrumbidgee and sailed down its unknown waters to its junction with the equally unknown Murray River and reached the Southern Ocean. But the greatest feat of all was that of Stuart who in 1860 traversed Australia from near Adelaide right to Port Darwin, after being baffled in two attempts, by the bush in one case and by natives in the second case.

Lastly, we come to the dark continent of Africa which has been neglected by explorers seeking the wealth of the Spice Islands. At that time the exploiting of Africa and the drain of slaves from Africa initiated by all Christian nations was, I think, perhaps the darkest stain ever inflicted on Christianity. Among the most important problems calling for solution was that of the Niger and, in 1795, Mungo Park was despatched to discover it. There was a great doubt as to whether it flowed east or west. At first one opinion was that it was the Senegal River that flowed into the Atlantic. Another was that it was lost in the interior. Mungo Park was sent especially to find in which direction it flowed. He landed on the River Gambia and spent some months with the British merchants, learning the language. He started on his great venture, first of all passing through districts which had trade relations with the British. He was well treated but they all told him he would have trouble further in. As soon as he got further in, somewhere near the Sahara, a Moorish chief seized him, taking everything he had—his interpreter and his slave—and he escaped with difficulty absolutely without resources and almost naked, but he continued the quest and one happy day he struck the Niger and was able to write: "I saw the majestic Niger, as broad as the Thames at Westminster and flowing slowly to the eastward." That adventure, I think, is one of the most moving in the whole history of exploration. He returned home to be feted and was sent off a year or two later with a large expedition to explore the Niger River and follow it down to its mouth.

You know in those days they never realized that only a youth could do those things. They sent a lot of middle aged tommies with them and they nearly all died. He reached the Niger with a few who were half dead—the rest had died on the way. He then apparently rebuilt a native craft and sailed down the Niger and was drowned in the Bussa Rapids.

Now we come to the epoch of Livingstone who served as a missionary in Bechuanaland, crossed the Kalahari Desert and discovered Lake Nigami in 1849. Two years later he penetrated north and discovered the upper reaches of the Zambezi in the centre of the continent, entirely unknown in those days. He then conceived the very bold idea of travelling westward. He made great friends with the warlike Makolo—he had no money and no backing and he got natives to come along with him without pay—and decided to cross Africa through the great Congo District and finally he reached Loando. There, by very good luck, an English cruiser called in and though Livingstone was very ill, he conceived the gigantic scheme in those days, of traversing the whole continent to the Indian Ocean. He went back to the Makolo country where as he recorded, "the most skilful of their diviners had pronounced us dead long ago". They were very pleased to see him again. Probably the natives were pleased—-it is to be hoped their wives were. He marched down the Zambezi where he discovered the wonderful Victoria Falls. He finally reached the Indian Ocean, having performed these astounding feats of exploration with practically no resources. On another expedition he discovered Nyasa Lake where we now have Nyasaland and when he died at Lake Bangwealo, he had established himself, without the least doubt, as the greatest of land explorers. Equally great were his services to humanity. As we all know Wilberforce and Burton had worked in parliament against the slave trade but Livingstone was the first man to carry out the active suppression of slavery on land.

I may say that one of the greatest treasures of the Royal Geographical Society is the tree under which Livingstone died. His servant cut in rude characters on the tree his name and the date and we heard that it was tumbling down so we sent out and had the part cut down and put a very suitable, I think, cement memorial in its place and around that are grouped the irons of the slaves which Livingstone took off.

Further north in Africa at about the same period Burton and Speke discovered Lake Tanganyika. Later, in the same year, Speke went off alone and discovered Victoria Nyanza, the chief source of the Nile, and thereby solved a puzzle that had baffled mankind since the days of Herodotus in the fifth century, B.C.

To conclude this epitome, our explorers have sown, but others have reaped. Time and again they have been outstripped in the race by Death, but they founded the British Empire, and it is for us to maintain and develop the priceless heritage which they, greatly daring, greatly enduring, have bequeathed to us.

Gentlemen, I have been asked to give a few words on the present situation in Persia. I understand one or two of you are interested in the Persian oil fields.

Today, in Persia, "the old order changeth, yielding place to new". The slogan of Shah Riza, Pahlair is westernization in a generation, coupled with the determination of replacing Europeans by Persians as far as possible. Large numbers of young Persians are studying in Europe. The education, generally, in Persia, is improving. Hospitals are being opened and the brigands are being killed off so the individuals are safe. In my day, I may say, you went about armed; if you didn't you got dropped and we had a sentry at night.

The most important enterprise is the construction of a railway from the Persian Gulf to the Caspian Sea, a distance of some 750 miles in length. The central plateau is very high. All the towns are in the south, and as the plateau averages some 5,000 feet above sea level, you may imagine that the rim of this plateau is considerably higher. Up in the north in the Capsian Province there is a great ridge which has to be tunnelled through and I understand—at least some people have said—the distance is fifty miles. I won't guarantee that; anyway it is a most enormously expensive undertaking and I doubt if it will pay expenses. In Canada you have had some experience in expensive railways and the difficulty in paying expenses. However, in this I sincerely hope I am mistaken. The financial anchor of Persia is the royalty from the Anglo-Persian Oil Company. I thought you might like to know a little about its history. I happen to know a little about it. The right to bore for oil was first granted to an Armenian by old Nasir-u-Din, the then Shah, some forty years ago. The concession was worked by an Englishman called D'Arcy in the Perso-Turkish frontier, who had made his money in a mine in Australia. He asked me to call on him. I was a humble Consul in those days, a captain, and he was a millionaire and quite well aware of the fact, may I say, to put it mildy. He told me what he was doing, but I explained to him if he found oil he could not get it out of Persia since the Turks would not allow a pipe-line across Iraq, nor would the then independent Persian states permit a pipe-line to the Persian Gulf. I told him that he would not be able to do it, that the people there were very warlike nomads and anyone who laid a pipe-line there would have his throat cut. He was very much annoyed. I said to him, "I have no axe to grind; I have no shares in it or anything of the sort and I don't mind telling you, you may find the oil—I know nothing about that—but if you do, you will screw it down and you won't be able to use it." I was for once a true prophet. About eighteen months later they found a gusher and screwed it down. They couldn't do anything with it. He spent a third of a million. If he had stopped when I told him, he would probably have spent only a quarter.

Then the Burmah Oil Company and Lord Strathcona took over the concession and I believe I was the first official to report the existence of the tremendous field. I believe I was the first official—I was told so, but I won't claim it. Anyway, a lot of Canadian boys, as you know, came out in the most frightful heat—the climate is around 124 and that sort of thing in the summer—and for a long time there seemed no likelihood of success. They wrote out saying to close down unless something turned up very quickly. Something very big did turn up, as we all know, and I should say, speaking as a man who knows nothing about it, that it is one of the richest oil fields in the world.

During the World War, we were given instructions to report seepages and I think we reported twenty-seven altogether in different parts of Persia, showing what a very rich oil field it is. The British Government, as you probably know, holds some two million of the ordinary shares which it took in 1914 and the company did very valuable work during the Great War. They supplied liquid fuel to all the ships in the Indian Ocean and the Eastern Mediterranean. They also repaired a great many of the river craft and built some, I think, for us, up the Tigris.

However, as I guess those of you interested in oil know, there was a certain amount of friction with the Persian Government in regard to royalties. I think the Persian Government, to put it plainly, were perfectly justified in wanting an up-to-date document or agreement. The Anglo-Persian Oil Company were also in favour of it, but the Persian Government asked enormous sums—I won't mention them, they were fantastic figures—and of course there was nothing doing. The Shah gave an ultimatum and went to the League of Nations and so on and finally good sense prevailed and a new contract was made by the terms of which they gave the Shah better terms and the new concession has been given for sixty years, and I think the arrangement is equally satisfactory to the Persian Government and also to the Anglo-Persian Oil Company.

I may say a tremendous amount of good which has been done by the Anglo-Persian Oil in Persia for civilization is almost indescribable. They employ 15,000 Persians who for the first time in their lives have been taught how to work steadily and regularly. They look after them extremely well, give them free education, they give education to the young men and supply free medical treatment. They built a thousand miles of road and altogether South-west Persia is by far the most civilized area of Persia and incidentally, I think the Shah finds it quite a big advantage to collect the taxes. You see, they get good pay.

In conculsion, my interest in Persia is life-long and it gives me intense pleasure to see that Persia is steadily moving up in the scale of civilization. (Applause.)

THE GOAT AND THE VINE

AN ADDRESS BY SIR ANDREW MACPHAIL

December 6, 1934

SIR ANDREW MACPHAIL was introduced by the President of The Empire Club, Mr. Dana Porter.

MR. DANA PORTER: Gentlemen, it is a privilege which is, perhaps, too rare, to be able to entertain a guest of honour from McGill University. We are so absorbed in this City with the idea of the importance of the University of Toronto that perhaps sometimes we fail to realize that there is another university which is equally or, perhaps, more important than the University of Toronto. This was once brought home to me rather strikingly when at a dinner in England I was sitting beside a graduate of an American university. He asked me where I came from and I told him that I was a graduate of the University of Toronto. He looked rather perplexed and said, "Toronto? —Toronto?—That is in McGill, is it not?" (Laughter.) Perhaps ignorance sometimes has a peculiar way of hitting upon the truth.

It is with great pleasure today that I introduce Sir Andrew Macphail who is well known to you all for his literary works. You are familiar with his military career and his distinction in the field of medicine.

Sir Andrew Macphail is now Professor of Medical History at McGill University and is eminent in a variety of activities. It is with very great pleasure that I introduce him now.

SIR ANDREW MACPHAIL: I find myself familiarly at home in this Empire Club. You are not ashamed of the term, "Empire." I am well aware that some years ago, many of us were out of Canada, and when we came home we discovered that some dialectician had found in the dictionary a new word to describe our status, the word "Commonwealth."

I remind myself also, that fourteen years ago I addressed this same Club upon a subject which at that time was merely of academic repute, but has since become one of stern reality. In that year I was in the company of twenty-eight of the most distinguished speakers in what was then known as the Empire, speaking to a Club which had more than four thousand members; and I now see signs that the Club is equally vital. General Fotheringham my military father, is at my right hand, and many of my comrades in the audience.

I propose today to present to you a new reading of the old fable "The Goat and the Vine." The Goat gnawed the Vine to the root; but the vine grew again, and yielded grapes whilst the goat lay dead upon the altar. It is only a fable; but every fable expresses a universal truth. Twenty years ago voices were crying aloud in the wilderness the fable of the "Wolf." Few believed them, but the wolf did come.

Germany is the Vine. France is the Goat. In these forty minutes, if you can bear with me, I propose to trace the process by which we too become the goat. History is the master to whom we all must go, history with his pensive and melancholy face. The thing that has been is the thing that will be; and the history passing under our eyes is the history hardest to read. Never was so much written, never so little understood. The thread is lost in the vast accumulation of contemporary writing. We must find that thread as a guide for the future.

In the early years of this century we forgot the desperate truth that war is the father of all things. We are yet living under the shadow of it. We also forgot the menace by which Disraeli, that unsentimental "old Jew," brought Bismarck to bay; "Whatever happens we will not drift into war; if we come to war, it will be because we intend it, and have an object to achieve." In 1914, we drifted, we were manouevered, into war. We had forgotten that things have their consequences. This is a warning for the future.

After the Boer war we had an uneasy conscience. We achieved "a splendid isolation," and found ourselves thwarted at every point. In 1904, we made an Agreement with France, made by Lord Lansdowne with his Flahault blood, and enthusiastically approved by Edward Grey with his innocent and exquisite nature. For him "the gloomy clouds were gone, the sky was clear, and the sun shone warmly;" he felt "as if there were some benign influence abroad" In ten years we were to pay the price of this benignity. Only two English voices were raised in warning, that of Lord Rosebery and Winston Churchill.

The fleet was removed from the Mediterranean to the North Sea. That was a sign to Germany. Then followed secret conversations between the naval and military staffs of the two nations. Protest as we might, that the Agreement demanded only diplomatic support and that these conversations were merely hypothetical, bonds were created that were inescapable, and war inevitable. No one in Canada and few in England, suspected the extent of those obligations. The question we should now put to ourselves is this: What obligation now exists whereby we may drift into war once more, or lay us under the charge of perfidy to France if we abstain? If again we are to fight side by side with the French, we should begin at once to devise a sound strategy, lest we and they be involved in a disaster similar to that which befell us in 1914. If it is to be war, now is the time to prepare. If it is to be peace, now is the time to make for peace, lest we drift into war once more.

We surrendered the conduct of the war to the French. We became the victims of their mistaken strategy and their internal political disorders. Until August 8th, 1918, every battle we fought was dictated not by military principles, but by French political necessity. A French general would be appointed not for his military capacity alone, but according as he was Protestant or Catholic, Royalist or Republican. The Somme was fought, "a marked failure," as Clemençeau says in his book, quoting the words of General Bugnet, "that it was later tried to pass off as a mere attempt to ease Verdun." Passchendaele was fought to cover up the courageous mutiny of sixteen French Divisions following Nivelle's mad disaster, a form of courage in which the British were sadly lacking. Battles that were lost were justified on the ground of political necessity.

Those who speak lightly of Sir Douglas Haig and the British army would do well to remember the bondage in which they worked. The recent criticism of Haig by Mr. Lloyd George is drawn from old French sources through the medium of a French-speaking Irishman whom I have described elsewhere as the Play-boy of the Western Front.

We fought continuously under the eye of French criticism. General Rawlinson surveying the Somme battlefield on the first day, when he lost 50,000 dead, was content. "The French," he declared, "will now be convinced that we are pulling our share." They were not convinced; they are not yet convinced. Fifty thousand gold sovereigns expended in the collection of the truth and disseminating it in the proper quarter by the adroit fingers of Lord Northcliffe would have been more fruitful in producing conviction. In the early days, no war-correspondents were allowed in the field The public was dependant upon official bulletins which in the attempt to deceive the enemy concealed from English and French alike the magnitude of the effort both were making.

In March 1918, both we and the French were faced with disaster by the last despairing effort of the Germans to separate the two armies and force their way to the sea. They fell upon the Fifth Army with all their force. General Gough fought a rear-guard battle of thirty miles, and brought them to the limit of their last advance. Gough in the first assault had none of the help promised by the French, and little, it may be added, from the British on his flank. The French in panic were falling back on

Paris; the British Cabinet was in panic too. That was the moment of the apparent ascendency of Foch over Haig. The event occurred at the Doullens meeting. But the Foch legend has long since perished.

By our complacency at Doullens, Foch allowed himself to believe that he was Generalissimo. Sir Douglas Haig has been given too much credit for his self-abnegation; he renounced nothing; he had the final formula under his hand: Le général Foch est chargé par les gouvernments britannique et français de coordonner l'action des armées aliées sur le front ouest. He will listen to, *s'entendra,* the Commanders-in-chief, who are invited to supply him with all necessary information. Haig's purpose was that Foch should coordinate the French, which he did; and leave Haig's strategy alone, which he also did; with the result that the war was over in 1918 instead of in 1919, which was the best Foch hoped for.

On the same day, March 26th, Foch visited Gough. He was in a state of excitement. He addressed to Gough a series of inane questions, and without waiting reply dismissed him from his Command and drove away. That night Gough who commanded 300,000 British soldiers, and had just won a crucial battle, had no place to eat or to sleep. There was no Lieut. Spears present to remind Foch as he had reminded Lanrezac, "England will never forgive France, and France cannot afford to forgive you." Neither Foch, nor Joffre either, thought sufficiently well of the English. Von Kluck was of a different opinion. He said to Col. Stewart Roddie, the first British officer he met after the war: "In the whole history of the world, there is, in my opinon, no military feat which has excelled, and few which have equalled, that accomplished by the first British army. My admiration for that army is greater than I can express."

With all his excellencies, Foch was not tactful. As Clemençeau said of him, he was without a magnaminous heart. Possibly he was not the best qualified to convey the terms of the Armistice to the Germans. They had accepted the terms on the basis of President Wilson's Fourteen Points, and on that basis they had agreed to evacuate France and Belgium, and to disarm. Two trains drew up side by side in the forest of Compiègne. In one was Foch; in the other Erzberger, who records: "The terms were given to me, dished out as to a dog, to swallow them whole. I could not believe it; it could not be possible. If I refused to accept the terms, it meant ten thousand lives thrown away each day. Cold sweat broke out upon me. I signed the armistice terms; and then I went out and was sick. I knew I was signing my death warrant." This is his own account to Col. Roddie. I recommend to you his "Peace Patrol." It was so. He was shot dead by the enemies he had aroused.

For the next seven months, the Treaty of Versailles was in the making. The Germans hoped for the best. They relied upon the 14 Points, they trusted the English. The English are *gerecht,* righteous, they said. They saw us in Cologne at Christmas, like guests in the house of a host. They remembered the address of Lloyd George from Downing Street on the day after the armistice: "No settlement which contravenes the principles of eternal justice will be a permanent one. Let us be warned by the example of 1871. We must not allow any sense of revenge any spirit of greed, any grasping desire to override the fundamental principle of righteousness. Vigorous attempts will be made to hector and bully the Government, to satisfy some base, sordid squalid ideas of vengeance and avarice."

These attempts were made, and we forgot our old Imperial way of peace. When a war was over it was over, and enemies must continue to live in the same world. General Smuts understood that principle. But the peace-making fell into quite other hands in the world-hysteria of which Paris was the centre: Lloyd George fresh from the hustings, a victim of the militant patriotism that returned him to power; Clemençeau with his tigerish temper; Wilson aghast as he felt his power slipping away; Orlando greedy for spoils.

The Treaty that emerged bore only the slightest resemblance to the 14 Points. Of the 22 peace terms, 19 were flagrantly violated; but Germany was disarmed and the blockade continued. They were compelled to accept the new terms imposed upon them. The Treaty was signed June 23rd, 1919, by Müller and Bell alone in the Hall of Mirrors, deathly pale, in a terrifying silence, with two thousand staring eyes fixed upon the ceiling. The two delegates were conducted out, like prisoners from the dock. As Bockdorff-Rantzau said, "the sentence was penal servitude instead of death." I recommend you to read Harold Nicolson's " Peacemaking."

In Germany the Treaty was received with indignation and horror, which was not lessened by the events of the subsequent occupations. The French are not sensitive to colour. The English and Germans are. The French quartered black troops upon them, even in the house of Queen Victoria's grand-daughter. The terms were impossible, but the Germans did their best to fulfil them. The indemnity demanded in gold was more than all the gold that has been extracted from the earth since the Spaniards discovered America.

The Vine was gnawed to the root. Let us now look at the new Germany that has arisen. It is only in the moment of a great emotion that a nation discloses itself. A nation is judged by the hero it creates for itself. The German hero is Hindenburg. The revealing emotion was aroused by his death, and his burial on the field of Tannenberg, made famous for all time by his victory, where he, the best known was laid side by side with the "unknown German soldier." He was the inspiration of the new Germany. We need not wonder at this renascence. Let us imagine our own future if some power should free us from private mortgage, from public debt, from derelict factories, from our National Railway. The spirit of our youth would assert itself.

Men see with the eyes they bring with them. Making allowance for that aberration, recent visitors tell us of a renewed youth hardened by exercise and by games to replace the fat boy and the *Backfisch* of the caricatures. There is "internal unity." Every one is at work. Labour and the emloyers of labour are brought under control. They are quite free to complain if they do not mind going to a concentration camp. Even the best of the Jews are satisfied. They desire only to be left alone by the Diaspora, the dispersed in America. They look upon that part of the American press controlled by the Jews as their most troublesome friends.

Most ominous of all, they have evoked a new religion. The manifesto was adopted at a Congress of which profesor Havet of Tübingon was the head, it was published in French in *L'Europe Nouvelle* in July, and in English translation by Professor A. H. Charteris. It contains twesty-seven articles divided into three parts, the Sublime, Morality, and Race. Although it lacks the logic of the Pauline theology and the precision of the Moslem, it like them may be a powerful force.

In the past sixteen years, the Germans have had their revolutions and civil wars. The French, and the Americans too, can well understand from their own history that these operations cannot be conducted without violence. But Germany has divested herself of the parliamentary garb that has never fitted her form, following the example of Russia, Italy, the United States and four other European nations. The war was intended to leave Democracy safe, but at the present rate of progress it will soon be safe in the grave. France likewise is making good progress in freeing herself; and we need not reproach those nations too bitterly for abandoning the forms of democracy, seeing that we ourselves endured a Commonwealth for only twelve years, and hailed the accession of Charles II. If the Germans choose to return to the Monarchy, it will not be for us to complain. We did not give much support to their new Republic.

The hardest to forgive is the one whom we have wronged. The Germans wronged us by the war. We wronged them in the peace. It is not yet too late to accept the divine advice to agree with the enemy lest worse befall. Germany is in the mood for agreement. She is confident and defiant. She is not bellicose or belligerent. She has had enough of that. The small mid-European nations are following this advice. But she must first convince us that she is able and willing to abide by the new terms.

Until the wrong in the treaty is set right there will be nothing more than an armistice, no peace, no security. Even in that time of world-hysteria the framers of the treaty had some such prevision. They showed the way in article XIX, inserted in the Covenant, which provides for "a reconsideration of treaties and of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world." The League of Nations can now restore its falling prestige by performing that inherent function, but it is as yet the main bulwark of the Treaty of Versailles.

French hatred and desire for revenge was not our hatred or our desire for revenge. The hatred inspired in the war diminished as we approached the Front. There were, of course, atrocities; but all war is an atrocity; and as Napoleon said, war breeds lies as the earth breeds worms; and Lord Northcliffe was the father of our propaganda. We came to believe it ourselves.

There is yet time at my disposal to return to Hindenburg, the national hero in his life, death, and burial. He was a Prussian, a soldier, the son of a soldier. He retired from the army in 1911. Living at his ease, in the 68th year of his age, he received a telegram from the Kaiser, asking him if he would take the field. His reply was "I am ready." In three weeks he cleared the Russians out of East Prussia. He was Commander-in-chief until the end, when he led the defeated army home. It was he who advised the Kaiser to abdicate; he was president of the Republic until his death at the age of eighty-seven. He adopted Hitler as his Chancellor and made it easy for him to succeed to the presidency; and yet he never swerved from his ancient loyalties to his Fatherland.

All this is written by himself in his *Aus Mienem Leben.* "My parents," he says "gave me the best that parents can give, a faith in God the master, an unbounded love for the fatherland, devotion to the Prussian kings." On his seventieth birthday the Kaiser, his king and master, was the first to bring him good wishes: "this was the greatest consecration of the day." He left the army to make room for younger men. "I must not leave the fact unmentioned," he notes, "that I was married in Stettin; my wife is a soldier's child too. I found in her a loving mate, loyally sharing joy and sorrow, care and labour, my best friend and comrade." She procreated with him one son and two daughters. He and their husbands all served in the war.

He assigns the causes of the war as they appeared to him: Germany was spreading too far abroad, and not strong enough in Europe. High tides of French jingoism threatened her; their origin was known. England and Russia gave power open or secret, conscious or unconscious, to those driving springs; there was a hostile policy mobilizing foreign rapacities against Germany with her open frontiers, her feeble allies, and unreliable populations beyond. He did not fear war; although it had "elevating effects," he wished it postponed as long as was thinkable.

Strange as it may seem, he does not believe that the Germans were responsible for the war. On the contrary, at the dedication of the Tannenberg Monument, September 18th 1927, Hindenburg expressed this dissent: "The whole German nation unanimously protests against the accusation that Germany is guilty of that greatest of all wars. It was not envy, hatred, or a desire for conquest that armed our hands. Pure of heart we went to war for the defence of our country. Germany is ready at any time to prove that to impartial judges."

He reconciled the army to the new order: "Comrades in the German army, which was so great and proud, why do you despair? Think of the men who more than a hundred years ago created the fatherland for us. Their religion was their belief in themselves and in the sacredness of their cause. This time too continuity with our great past will be preserved and reestablished." He resigned his command in June 1919, when the Treaty of Versailles was signed. Once more he went into retirement at Hanover, where he looked with complacency upon the list of "war criminals" whose surrender was to be sought, although his own name was second on the list. He knew it was all a sinister farce, a pretence to gratify the baser elements by the scent of blood, "a madness," as Lord Rosebery thought it.

In his own appeal to the electors, he declared: An attempt must be made to carry out the international agreements of recent years; but if the future shows that Germany cannot carry out her obligations, then better ways must be sought in peaceful collaboration with these States.

Nor does one look for precision of statement in a funeral oration. On the day of Hindenburg's death, the Government issued a proclamation, calling to mind his inestimable merits making for the peace and welfare of the people; when everything else was shaking, he remained steadfast; he built the bridge from the past to the future. The nation would preserve a grateful and inspiring memory of a soldier and politician, an example of austere and heroic conception of duty. On the day before the funeral, the Fuhrer addressed the Reichstag in a lyric, reciting his deeds, and the faith he kept with his people. At the burial service next day, these sentiments were renewed.

In his Testament which was used to good purpose by Hitler in the election, he expresses the assurance that what he longed for in 1919 came to slow fruition in 1933, when Hitler became Chancellor, and would ripen into the complete perfection of the historic mission of his people. "So, I can close my eyes in peace." But yet, he was equally convinced that "when the present tidal wave of wild political passions and empty phrases had subsided, the rock of the German Kaiserdom would reappear." It is an ambiguous testament.

His funeral the *Times* thought the most impressive since the funeral of Queen Victoria. And it adds editorially that the flags flown at half-mast over hundreds of unofficial buildings in London were a British tribute to the courage and patriotism of this Prussian soldier, whose character remained unspoiled by victory, and unshaken by defeat. This, it concludes, "was the last great muster of the veterans who fought under Hindenburg with dogged courage against half the world." MacKensen was there. Von Kluck was on his own deathbed. A nation is to be judged by the heroes it adopts as its own.

These sentiments were general. In Paris even, *L'Illustration* did him the compliment of comparing him with Joffre "with whom he had much in common: la ponderation, le sangfroid imperturable, le bon sens, la volonté tenace, et aussi la même bonhomie ironiques le même equilibre intellectual et physique, le même appétit robuste, et jusqu'à la même faculté de recuperation nerveuse par le sommeil. "France remembers only one thing —from one end to the other of his long life he was le serviteur intègre et passionné de son pays."

His final appraisal of himself is contained in his last confession: As a human being I thought my own thoughts, acted and erred. In my life and actions I was not influenced by the applause of the world, but by my own conviction, conscience, and sense of duty. My vision is unshaken, turned forward and upward, and will so remain. The Vine is growing from the root once more; but the wine to be yielded by the grapes may be a wine of hot and bitter tears.

(Prolonged applause.)

GOOD MUSIC MADE POPULAR

AN ADDRESS BY MR. REGINALD STEWART

December 13, 1934

MR. REGINALD STEWART was introduced by Mr. Dana Porter, the President of The Empire Club.

MR. DANA PORTER: Mr. Reginald Stewart has been wise enough to realize that ever since the days of Sir Walter Raleigh, man has been a smoking animal. At all places of entertainment in this country smoking is generally forbidden, with the exception of the Promenades, conducted by Mr. Stewart, and it may be that in this way he has succeeded in making man feel a bit more comfortable about the prospect of spending an evening listening to good music, that he has induced them to believe and has convinced them that good music is not necessarily some obscure mystery only dimly understood, perhaps, by some exclusive priesthood. He has convinced them that it is a simple pleasure and this could not be done and his very great success could not have been maintained unless he was a first class artist which we all know he is, and unless he had had that magnetic personality which has succeeded in bringing together and leading a first rate symphony orchestra and also in attracting over seven thousand people to hear him, himself, play the piano.

It is with very great pleasure that I call on Mr. Reginald Stewart.

(Mr. Stewart was received with prolonged applause.)

MR. REGINALD STEWART: I must first of all tell you how very much I appreciate this very warm welcome you have given me today and I must thank you, Sir, for the very generous estimate you have made of my contribution this last summer. I hasten to assure you that the success of these concerts was not due to my efforts alone, but also to the energetic and devoted co-operation of many others who worked with me.

One of the nice things about the "Proms" was that I could express myself in music and did not have to express myself in words which is a much more difficult task. I was trying to think how uncomfortable Chauncey Depew was. He was making a tour of an art gallery and stopped opposite a picture of Daniel in the lion's den. One of the ladies said that she could never understand why Daniel looked so happy in such a tremendous predicament. Chauncey Depew, who had given many after dinner speeches, said that he was quite sure the reason was that he was quite sure that at the end of a meal, he would not be required to make a speech.

One of the other nice things about the "Proms" was that we were enabled to come into contact for the first time with a great many people who had never heard personal concerts and had thought of them as something too difficult for them to understand. We are very glad for this, as it is a great pity that the general public should regard good music, classical music, either as mere technical show or as something beyond their capacity to enjoy. After all, music is inherent in us all. It is fundamentally a part of our nature. We read of its early manifestation in the Book of Genesis—right at the beginning of things—of Jubal and his sons with their lyres, trumpets, cymbals and lutes. Further on in the Bible we read of David the warrior, statesman, poet, king and musician, expressing in song what he could not express in any other way—his devotion toward Jehovah, his God.

Music is the real universal speech of mankind. Whereever one goes in the world today one finds this same universal love of music manifesting itself in every tribe, nation, kingdom and people. There are just as many children beating drums and blowing horns in the jungles of Africa as there are in the drawing-rooms of America. Experts tell us that the folk music of the North American Indians is curiously similar to music in countries as remote as Siberia; so that this feeling that a proper understanding of music is beyond the capacity of the average person is quite unwarranted in most cases. Music is a part of our nature and we respond to it quite naturally. We may not always understand why music thrills us, as was the case of the "Prom" goer who wrote to me: "I do not know anything about music but I like the effect it has on me. I leave your concerts exhilerated and refreshed." (Applause.)

That is the case of a man who will not pay $2.00 or $2.50 to hear music which he is quite sure he will not appreciate but will risk 25 cents to see what it is all about, especially if he is assured by some friend that on any programme there is bound to be something which he is sure to be able to understand. Now, once you get such a man into the hall, the trick is done. He looks about and sees seven or eight thousand other people there—ordinary folk like himself, to whom this same music evidently means a great deal. The blare of the trumpets, the clash of the cymbals and the ominous rolling of the tympani stir his pulse and excite him strangely, and by the time the conclusion of the concert is reached, the man has made the thrilling discovery that he too has joined the ranks of the music lovers. That is one case; there are literally hundreds that came to my attention, personally, during the summer business men, trades people, people in all walks of life wrote to me. I brought along a letter from a domestic, I thought you might be interested in: "May I say I was one of the many who attended last week's wonderful concert and I haven't minded one bit doing without a meal on more than one occasion in order to hear the sweetest, and the most thrilling music on this side of Heaven. My heart goes out in gratitude to you and all the other members of the orchestra who have made it possible for such as I to attend the concerts."

One feels that one would like to do much more for this humble lover of music and those she represents. After all, what right have we to presume a taste for the best to be the prerogative of the few? Is it because the general public have been conspicuously absent at high class concerts? If so, why have they been absent? How can we account for the seeming reluctance of the public to attend good concerts? Undoubtedly, formality has played a formidable role in discouraging their presence. Then, too, there seems to exist in most concerts a barrier between the artist and the audience. It is very difficult to say exactly of what this barrier consists. It is an intangible atmospheric quality--but very real, nevertheless. It almost seems as though a great gulf were fixed between the artist and the audience over which one may not pass to the other. It may be necessary to have this traditional restraint in concerts though I very much doubt it. In any case, we must admit that it has a very cooling effect upon the audience.

I am never quite sure in my own mind whether or not the conductor is capable of breaking down that barrier. I am sure there are quite a number of people who look on the conductor as a rather useless animal whose contribution to the performance is confined to a violent waving of the hands and hair in such a manner as is best calculated to attract attention to himself; and that he must study his tailoring so that the ladies who attend his concerts may admire his shoulders and back and that as far as the orchestral players under him are concerned, it really doesn't matter what he does since they are sawing away without even looking at him. Then there are other people who look upon the conductor as a sort of a magician who can pull from the arms and mouths of his players in some mysterious way the beautiful sounds they hear. Neither is right; it is neither show nor magic, but the mastery of a complete sign language by which the conductor issues his commands and achieves his results. With the baton and a great number of movements of hand, wrist and arm, the conductor indicates the tempo and its changes, the dynamics, the expression, and in fact all the inner spirit and meaning of the music.

It has been suggested that it might possibly interest you to know something of the problems that confront a conductor before and during a symphonic performance.

Assuming that the conductor has mastered the actual technic of conducting, he first approaches a new orchestral work by studying the full score. To the average layman and to a great many musicians, a full score appears to be about as intricate as a blue print of a complicated engine. The blue print represents on paper every detail of the engine and likewise the musical score is an exact description on paper of every detail of the musical composition. Those of you who are familiar with the ordinary piano score with two staves will have some idea of what a conductor's score looks like when I tell you that instead of the two staves the eye is here called upon to comprehend any number from twenty-four to thirty in a glance. This seemingly impossible task can be accomplished by patient and systematic practice. Most conductors faced with the study of a new work begin by getting the architectural or general impression of the work. This is followed by a study of the individual parts, then comes the detailed study of the individual sections—strings, woodwind, brass and percussion. Then comes the mental hearing of the work, either in part or as a whole; and, finally, a piano transcription, as a means of checking up and ratifying mental concept.

When you see a building for the first time, scarcely anything more than the general type of architecture, the size, symmetry and colour, is made upon the mind. The details of construction, materials used, number of floors, style of windows and doors are only comprehended after closer study.

At the first view of the musical score, the impression made is just about as general as in viewing a building. Closer study reveals the details of construction and the playing on the piano gives the harmonies and polyphonic content of the work.

Some conductors learn the content of a score very quickly by listening to the orchestra as they rehearse. But no matter how astute a conductor is, his players always detect when they are being used as a means of a leader learning the score and their respect for him is lowered, and every conductor wants the respect of his players. Some go to great lengths to win it. There is a story of a young conductor who wished to impress his men with a display of sharp hearing. So he secretly wrote a false F sharp in the second bassoon parts of a particularly loud and boisterous passage. During the rehearsal he suddenly stopped the orchestra and cried out: "F. sharp, F. sharp in the second bassoon is wrong", only to be answered by the first basson player, "Beg pardon, Sir, the second bassoon is absent today."

Conditions now are much more satisfactory than they were a few years ago to the conductor, when the movie theatres gave the players such alluring contracts that symphonic performances and rehearsals could be treated with considerable indifference. In London it was quite customary for a new set of substitutes to appear in each of the rehearsals before the performance and a complete new set suddenly to appear at the concert. There is a perfectly true story of Sir Thomas Beecham, the well-known conductor appearing at the third rehearsal before the performance with the London Symphony Orchestra and on glancing over the band finding a completely new group of men. He looked around in dismay and eventually found one player — a flautist — whom he recognized as having been there before. "I congratulate you, Sir", he said, "on having attended three consecutive rehearsals". The player rose to his feet and courteously bowed to Sir Thomas, and said, "Thank you very much Sir Thomas, but I am sorry to have to tell you that I shall not be able to attend the concert."

The increased amount of preparatory work involved in memorizing a score certainly gives one an increased insight into the composition and to be freed from the necessity of reading the printed page gives a much greater authority and command in the whole attitude of the conductor at the performance. We never read of an officer leading his troops to battle with his eyes glued on the map, and we have all heard of the conductors who have their heads in the score instead of the score in their heads.

To come back to the public's reluctance to attend concerts, I feel that another reason is that there has been, in certain musical quarters, evidence of a desire to keep music for the select few who were considered capable of understanding it. Possibly this has been brought about through the diminishing audiences, which led artists to take consolation in the thought that they had reached such high levels of interpretative genius that only the select few who had enough intellectual development could follow them into the rarified atmosphere of the upper regions.

Small, select audiences have become the rule rather than the exception. Music halls have been diminishing in size and the trend for the last few years has been toward the smaller more intimate concert.

During these same years, however, a vast radio public has been hearing, more or less unconsciously, some of the world's greatest music performed by the greatest artists. The Symphony which formerly might have been heard in Toronto once in five years could now be heard five times in one month and thus a rich mine of musical appreciation has been developing under the surface, unperceived by the musicians as a whole. The Promenade experiment was a sort of preliminary drilling into the mine to ascertain the depth and quality of the ore which so few suspected lay beneath our feet. Now the full treasures are becoming apparent on every hand and in the most unlikely quarters. Where people have taken no interest in art, enthusiasm bubbles forth; art having taken an interest in them.

It has always been my hope that I might be able to make a vital contribution to the more general appreciation of music in Toronto and I am happy to think that some of you feel that this hope has already been realized, at least in part. I say, in part, because I am quite convinced that there is a potential audience five times the size of that witnessed last summer in Toronto.

(Applause.)

Nothing can be done, however, for this new material until a concert hall large enough to accommodate them is available. There is not one building in Toronto perfectly designed for music, of sufficient size to make possible the greatest performances at really popular prices. Such a concert hall must definitely be planned for in the immediate future if this new era in Toronto's musical development is to be carried through to its full fruition.

Had I ventured such talk as this a year ago I'd have been dubbed a deluded visionary. Who would have believed that there were ten thousand people in this city who would attend a symphony concert weekly—even if you gave it to them gratis? The "Proms" have established that fact and I am still talking sense when I say there is a potential audience of at least 15,000 to hear the best music in Toronto. (Applause).

The large music hall is the solution to every financial problem with which our musical organizations are faced. If concerts which are now being performed to relatively small audiences at tremendous cost to a few public-spirited guarantors, could be given to the mass of the people at prices that would fit every pocket, they would meet with such overwhelming response as to eliminate deficits altogether.

I wish with all my heart that the performance of the St. John Passion which our Bach Choir gives annually to 1,200 or 1,500 people in a relatively small hall, could be given in a place seating comfortably an audience five times that size. At present this is impossible as the size of the halls available make it imperative that comparatively high prices be charged if a substantial deficit is to be avoided.

I am sure as I am of anything that our whole "Prom" audience would flock to hear the "Passion," if they could hear it at prices from 25 cents to $1.00, and when I think of how they would enjoy it, it grieves me very much to think I can not do this thing.

The Mendelssohn Choir's magnificent performance of Bach's B Minor Mass a few weeks ago should have been heard by 10,000 instead of by 2,600. Why wasn't it? Because the largest hall only seats 2,800, and in order to make the concert self-sustaining, prices have to be charged which would keep away the other 7,200 even if the building were large enough to accommodate them.

When are we going to be able to say to the people, "Come and hear the greatest orchestras, the greatest choirs, and the greatest artists in the world at prices from 35 cents to $1.00" (Applause). You may answer, "As soon as such a building can be demonstrated to be a profitable investment." But I don't think we should wait until then. Surely there are enough public-spirited men and women of means in Toronto who will get together and take advantage of the present co-operative feeling of civic, provincial, and dominion authorities toward public building projects, and by personal contributions aided by public subscription, raise the funds necessary to present the building, debt-free, to the citizens of Toronto.

This is the thought I would leave with you, Gentlemen, and I assure you I shall not rest until much more has been accomplished for the music-loving, but economically restricted people of Toronto—something strong, fine, something permanent, that will be of inestimable value, both educationally and socially, and that will spread abroad throughout our citizenry the happiness that music was meant to bring them. (Hearty applause).

MR. DANA PORTER: Mr. Stewart has very kindly con sented to supplement this most interesting and most delightful address with two selections on the piano.

Mr. Stewart delighted his audience by playing two selections from the compositions of Franz Liszt: The Etude in B Flat; and Rhapsody Number 15.

To the persistent demand for an encore, he responded by playing the Liebestraum also a Liszt Composition.

EXCITING EVENTS

AN ADDRESS BY HIS WORSHIP, MAYOR JAMES SIMPSON

Thursday, January 10, 1935

The guest speaker was introduced by the President of The Empire Club, Mr. Dana Porter.

MR. PORTER: His Worship, the Mayor, has chosen as the subject of his address to this Club today, "Exciting Events". It is probably true that a man who is really sensible to the excitement underlying the trend of events of the times must himself be of a stimulating personality. Throughout the long life of public service of His Worship, during which he has rendered service to this city as well as to other causes that are well known, this great record of his has been essentially a triumph of personality. And in addition to that, it must inspire him with a feeling of great pride and no little satisfaction to feel that the spirit of the time is, more than it ever has been, receptive to those principles to which he has always adhered and to those ideas which he has always persistently advocated.

I wish on behalf of the Empire Club—and I may say that there may be some here today who did not show the prescience and common sense, perhaps, to cast a vote for Mayor Simpson on New Year's Day themselves, but I am sure even those will join with the other members of the Club and guests in most hearty congratulations and in a welcome to this Club today—the first public appearance I believe Mr. Simpson has made since he became Mayor.

I think it is also fitting that I add, also on behalf of the Club, our most hearty congratulations to Mr. Somers who has been City Clerk for many years and who is with us at the head table. (Hearty applause). We all know the honour that has recently been conferred upon him by His Majesty, the King.

It is with great pleasure that I call upon His Worship, the Mayor of Toronto.

HIS WORSHIP, MAYOR SIMPSON: Mr. President and Gentlemen: I want to first of all express my own personal thanks to the Empire Club for giving me the honour to come before its members and others who are interested and, at the same time, to express to the citizens of Toronto my great pleasure at my election to the high position of Chief Magistrate and Mayor of this wonderful City of Toronto. (Applause.)

I am also very pleased that at the head table with me are my colleagues, members of the Board of Control, and we will work together during the coming year in a spirit of cooperation and good will, that we may render to the citizens of this City the type of service which they desire from men who are sincerely interested in the making of the City of Toronto the greatest city of its size in the world.

I do not know whether most of you are acquainted with my colleagues but I would like them to present themselves if they will rise while I mention their names: My good friend, Controller Robbins; (Applause) and my good friend, Controller McBride; (Applause) who, by unanimous choice, has been selected as our Vice-Chairman and President of the Council for the year. I am sorry—we had Controller Ralph Day with us, but he has gone, I presume to fill another engagement; and our colleague, Controller Wadsworth had to attend another meeting in West Toronto. He rang me up before I came and I said that I would excuse him and explain to the audience the reason he was not with us.

Now, Gentlemen, I recognize and realize to the fullest extent the great responsibility which is resting upon me at this time. You have invited me to deliver an address and I selected for my subject the one which has been recited to you by the President, the Chairman on this occasion. I did that because it was the wording that was uppermost in my mind when I was invited by my friend, Main Johnson, to speak to you. Each day of this present decade seems to have had some special thrill for me because of the ever continued evidences of a great change in the social order and it does seem, as your President has intimated, that some of the thoughts which have been uppermost in my own mind during many years have taken root in the minds and conceptions of men, not because they have been my ideas or my thoughts at all, but simply because I had expressed them openly, very candidly and, sometimes, courageously, having regard for the consequences of my utterances. And, therefore, I feel that at this time what I have to say and what is being said is of special interest to every citizen of this great city of ours because it seems to be the culmination of a great deal of, sometimes, acrimonious discussion, throughout the past few decades, and things are looming up or evolving as possibilities, and because of that the future realities may be measured in terms of the dreams and visions of the men who entertained those thoughts and ideas. But there is one great basic reason why this occurs. We are not all capable of producing the finest kind of creative thinking and I doubt very much sometimes whether any one in the human form is really responsible for any creative thinking or what I shall call originality in their thinking and expression, because sometimes we are merely vehicles, merely mediums, through which the finer thoughts which are conceivable are expressed and for that reason we should not take too much unction to our own souls when we have been saying things and doing things which have been an inspiration to others.

At this particular time, particularly the last few days, the minds of the citizens of this great country have been turned to what appears to be a revolution in the thinking of the Prime Minister of our great country and which for a man holding that high position of responsibility and trust and a man who has had the confidence of the citizens of this country to the extent he has in enabling him to occupy that very dignified and important position, must be regarded by every one of us as making a contribution to the thought of our nation which is worth while considering. (Applause). It commands the attention of every man, no matter what his political views may be, and if we are all generous enough and free enough from political partisanships and prejudices and are guided by the truth in our everyday actions, if there is anything said with which we agree and in which we believe, we should be courageous enough to say it, no matter who is the expressor of it. (Applause). And I was very much interested, and this is something I want to present to you at this time, I was interested in ascertaining just how far the Prime Minister of Canada has travelled in his more recent declarations, and to measure the distance he had travelled I obtained a copy of the address he delivered before the Imperial Conference in the City of Ottawa not very long ago. This is his utterance on that occasion: A state controlled standard of living, state controlled labour, state aided dumping, dictated by high state policy conflicts in theory and in practice with the free institutions of the British Empire. The subordination of individual rights and liberty to a national economic plan affronts our whole idea of national development. We must be active in the defence of our institutions. We must put before all else our peace and happiness.

Now, in the light of that declaration, analysis must of necessity be made as to the measure in which the Prime Minister of this country has changed his attitude upon the great questions he has been discussing. I can say to you frankly, Gentlemen that it is nothing new for me to understand the significance of the statements which he has made because in a sense they are of a revolutionary type of thought, revolutionary because they are getting somewhat away from the old basis of our discussions, if those discussions particularly apply to the conditions of life under which we have been living and the circumstances of life which we are all acquainted with.

In every nation in the world I see the evidences of change continuously, and the change is in a definite direction always, either progressive or reactionary, and I must confess that my conclusion, from many years of representing this great nation in Geneva and of attending conferences in the Mother Country and in travelling somewhat extensively, and I have had a fairly good opportunity of measuring the trend of thought in the nations of the world toward its specific destiny, and the proudest thing in my life today is to realize that whatever this tendency may be and we are all interested in it, it is to me—I am speaking for myself, an evidence that we are approaching progessively toward a realization of the great spiritual and moral forces which have operated continuously in society. (Applause). It is to me the evidence of this fact that we are gradually emerging from our appraisement of life and all its potentialities and all its significance, from units of great population in various decades that have been conscious all the time and have been motivated too much by the acquirement of the purely physical and material things of life and have neglected the higher spiritual and moral powers which man possesses, (applause) and I am less surprised, perhaps, than most of you are in Mr. Bennett, in the change of attitude he has taken as a great statesman because if, as his profession indicates to me from public utterances and contacts, he is a Christian man; that is, he has accepted as the basis of his own personal path, conditions that must of necessity enter into his public responsibilities and duties. He has accepted a basis for human conduct which motivates him and inspires him to do the things which he does and my own conclusions are that if he is animated by the right kind of idealism, based on a true Christian conception he will evolve toward the time when, with the masses of our intelligent wealthy men as well as others, he will realize the instability of material and physical possessions and will realize the eternal verities of the spiritual and moral forces of the human being.

Consequently, when we discuss the economic policy of a great nation there is only one view we should possess in the development of any economic policy that has to do with a nation, the spirit and life of which is represented in individual men, women and children, and the first consideration of us all, no matter what political party we belong to, is how we are going to husband the resources of nature in the most economic and efficient manner to serve the highest physical and material needs of the citizens within our community. And when I say that, my citizen friends, I am conscious of the differentiation which is being made today by Christian men in the various religious denominations as to their responsibility in the pulpit as the leaders of religious thought. There are those who believe they should run to the one extreme of emphasizing only the spiritual and moral qualities of man, that which is eternal within us; and others, perhaps, who think we should emphasize more strongly the physical and material ideas and are talking along that particular line which is involved in various forms of political action and programmes and policies for reconstruction. My own conclusion, after years of actual service in many forms, is that the man who wants to be a real religious teacher today in this city or anywhere else, should make that happy combination of assembling the physical and material side of our lives with the spiritual and the moral, and try and point out that taking advantage of God's great bounty, physical and material, in an equitable distribution of the great bounties He has given us to satisfy adequately the physical and material needs of us all and not too abundantly, is a very important function in the administration of the affairs of any great nation. And at the same time, a nation cannot be really great unless its statesmen and citizens are animated by that Divine guidance, the basis of all true spiritual and moral development which has been given to us by the Holy Bible itself.

That may seem to you to be a very unique way for the Mayor of this City to express himself but I am just doing to you now what I have been trying to do to the masses of the people wherever I have been during the past years. The only difference is that now you are beginning to understand me a little better than you did twenty-five years ago. (Laughter and applause). And I want to say that my educational function or responsibility is progressively continuous because as I read some of the editorials in the daily newspapers I see there is great room for improvement yet. (Laughter). You cannot always measure newspapers and newspaper editors by the lessons they preach; you have to judge them and measure them by their examples and practices from day to day and consequently, I am naturally impelled by my inner self to say at this time that I want to pay this tribute to the Prime Minister of this country. The future alone will show and indicate how sincere the Prime Minister is, just as it does with us all, in fact. We preach one thing today and if our neighbours and friends find day by day as we walk along our way, that we are not carrying out what we preach, their faith diminishes and they do not have much stock in us after all. The statesman is in exactly the same position. If he outlines a new policy which is not in conformity with the precedents established and the precedents he has always followed and he afterwards forgets all about it, by doing so he impresses on our minds that he didn't try as seriously as he should to increase the confidence of the people in him and he must suffer the lack of confidence of the people in him and in his declaration at the time he makes it. That is his responsibility and he must be prepared to take the consequences if his actions are not true to the ring in the magnificent gospel which he is preaching.

Now, I am not a Liberal; I am not a Conservative; I am a Labour man, affiliated with the C.C.F. organization. I know that a lot of you voted against me because I was C.C.F. That is neither here nor there in the discussion of this question this morning, because if we are truly imbued with an idea we are right it is not a question of any temporary circumstance that will influence us; it is just the spiritual satisfaction that comes to us as we travel along the way—that is it.

In this case Mr. Bennett has laid out a programme for the future, a programme which at least gives assurance of the establishing of a better basis of equity and fairness in the relationship of employers and employees, a check upon the over avaricious and the over greedy which are in control of the very means of life of the masses of our people, a far and generous consideration for the toiling masses who for years and years have felt they have been excessively exploited in order to give the luxuries of life to those who were not deserving of them. And I don't say that in what I shall call a general explanation because there are magnificent exceptions to the rule always, and among some of our industrial kings today and our great financiers, there are hearts which beat just as tunefully as my own does toward the higher things of life. When I came to the luncheon of the Bank of Commerce in this building the other day, the friendship expressed, the welcome hand extended to me made me think I was in the meeting of the Toronto District Labour Council. (Laughter). So, after all, you see we are all human and we all have the capacity to be endowed with the finest and most gracious gifts it is possible for the Creator to endow us with and material wealth does not make a particle of difference between the relationships of men, even though one is endowed with great wealth and the other has not a cent to call his own. If we can get that impression into the minds of some of our editors they won't blackguard me all the time because I haven't any property in my own name. (Laughter).

I see my old friend, George Henry, smiling. He never had to submit himself to the public ostracism that I have during the years of my public life, although there are some not any too kind to him.

What I will say is that these are thrilling or exciting changes which are taking place and there is an abundance of them. I will get back to Mr. Bennett in a moment. I want to point this out: I have been a visitor in England on many occasions and I have tried to get the pulse of the political life of the Mother Country. Whatever may be said about the nations of the world and their contribution to human betterment, world wide, I am firmly of the belief and am convinced it is going to be up to the British Empire to give leadership in the fullest and noblest things and in their development, and I had to suffer a humiliation at Geneva not more than eighteen months ago when for the first time there came to the Labour organization and the Workers Group, particularly, delegates from a country which had had a revolution and the superiority complex displayed there which made all the other nations feel an inferiority complex was not at all to my liking, and I want to assure you that I am a firm believer in the democracy of Great Britain and the British institutions because whatever we may think about the masses of our citizens, the only true and noble way of dedicating the masses to the higher levels of intelligence and understanding of government institutions and the laws under which they have to be governed is in placing the responsibility for government upon the unit of the population because any other system that delegates to the few a mandatory power, as the heads of authority to do the thinking for the people, are not administering public affairs in the manner they should be administered if you are going to have an intelligent population and have the laws administered on an equitable and just basis. That is why I believe in the British system. I have sat in the Mother of Parliaments; I have sat in the Reichstag in Germany; I have sat in the Chamber of Deputies in France; in the New Zealand Parliament and in the United States Congress and in many of the buildings which have been erected for the administration of affairs of great nations, but not any one appears like the British House of Commons and the House of Lords—though I may not cheer so lustily for the House of Lords—(Laughter and applause) and I want to say I am proud. I am a greater Britisher today than I was three years ago, (Further applause) and that is with no ill will toward any other nation in the world because my gospel is a gospel of international good will, of international peace, of international solidarity, and of the elemination of war as a means of settling international differences. Consequently, I naturally turn to the declaration of the Prime Minister of this country made very recently which shows a distinct trend toward another economic basis of life for the people of this great nation. It comes to us with greater worth and power because he is the Prime Minister of one of the youngest nations in the world but which holds the fifth position at Geneva in the industrial conferences because of the significance of our material development. And the significance to me is enriched because I realize that this country's potentialities are an indication of the realities of the future and we have no conception of what this great nation of ours is going to be like in the years which are to come. I only wish I could live another hundred years! And if you will be kind to me in the future, little better than in the past I may give a good deal longer. (Laughter). You know I come from good old Scotch and English stock. That is about as good a breed as you can have—mixing a little Irish—

CONTROLLER MCBRIDE: I am glad you brought in the Irish!

MAYOR SIMPSON: Sam is glad I brought in the Irish. I want to have peace with him for the rest of the year. (Laughter).

I don't want to inflict too much upon you but I am not through. (Voices: Go on, Go on!) I wouldn't think of closing the address just where I am now. I am just like Premier Bennett is going to be when he makes the last radio address—and the Star is waiting to hear that before they comment on it. Sometimes the sting is in the tail. I am just wondering whether it is going to be a sting or a nice pot of honey he is going to have in the final discussion and analysis of what he said before. Whatever that may be, we are all interested in finding out what the composite is to be after he has given his various deliverances over the radio. I was glad to read in the paper that Jimmy Woodsworth had given approval with some modifications which had, of necessity to be made, to the sentiments expressed by the Prime Minister recently over the radio.

Here is my thought: Whatever we may think of each other in our every day life and close contacts, and we may perhaps understand that environment and education and the circumstances of life may make a distinct contribution to the differentiations which we have in the expressions of opinion, because we are susceptible to all kinds of influences which are round us in the formation of our opinions and ideals and in the expression of those opinions, whatever these differences may be, I think we will all try to be tolerant enough and generous enough to give some credit to other men if they differ with us in the opinions they express and I have it within my own soul and mind to say this now, that however much I may differ from you in the purposes of my life and the objectives I have before me, I hope the day will come when the profit motive will be eliminated entirely from industry and commerce in this nation and the other nations, when co-operation and service is the maximum of the contribution we can make when the gifts and endowments we possess will be so activated by us all that we shall not have the distinctions in society which we have today, of the opulent wealth on the one hand and the degrading poverty upon the other. (Applause).

I say that, my friends, because it is unchristian; it is not in harmony with the will of Christ or the will of God and when men are animated by the higher ethics and the higher spiritual conceptions of life they subordinate their private and personal interests to the good of others and the real enrichment of life. The joys and the satisfactions that are worth while can only come to men who render the greatest service with the endowments they have, not for themselves but for their fellow men as they travel along the road to the higher destiny in the world which is to be.

Consequently, the only true basis of the association of men is that association which comes because of their common belief that we are only here for a day and that is all. When measured with the span of Eternity, a three score years and ten on earth is a very insignificant particle of Eternity. If you don't believe there is an Eternity, if you don't believe the soul is immortal, then I can't see anything else but that you will travel in the valley of despair. If you are a believer in the immortality of the soul and the higher development and the continuous development which proceeds on and on after you are through in this life, then you will get lots of inspiration to do the things you ought to do in self-abnegation and sacrifice in order that those who are under-privileged and not so endowed as you and I are will profit by the contribution you have made during the day you are on this earth. And if there is any citizen who fears that because Jimmy Simpson is the Mayor of the city, by some mysterious process or programme he is going to suddenly by some revolutionary method change you from the present economic position in which you find yourselves into poverty and deny you the rights you have as citizens, you have mistaken the man. If there is going to be any change at all in your material and economic status, so far as I am concerned, it is coming about by education, by an entirely different point of view and by following closely the British precedent of arguing the matter out, converting each other if we can, and by your intelligent vote sending men to Canadian parliament to carry out the highest aims of its statesmen in order that the nation as a whole may eventually emerge, not as a nation which appraises life in dollars and cents but in the service which we render to our fellow men and the contribution we have made during the time we have had that supreme opportunity.

And I want to say to Mr. Bennett, "Godspeed—if you are not just exactly where I am in your programme, you are at least travelling the same direction." He is travelling the same direction and if Mr. Bennett requires any stimuli or encouragement to make good what he is promising now and he will invite me to give it, I will give him all the stimuli he wants along that particular line and I hope in the days to come as we develop this great nation —just think of it! A nation which nature has decreed shall produce the strongest, the most virile, physically and intellectually, of any nation in the world. If He had not so designed it, He would have connected the St. Lawrence River with the Atlantic Ocean at an equal depth so the steamships could come from the Atlantic to the inland ports by an interior waterway, and have made the cities for all time to come on the Great Lakes. But He has placed obstacles in the way, that His own creatures, you and I, should have the supreme opportunity of expressing the finest intellectual gifts with which men have been endowed in the solving of the problems and the overcoming of the difficulties in the study of the technique of engineering and other great difficulties so that in the days to come there shall be monuments erected to the genius of our Canadian citizens. And we are proud that we are citizens of this great nation and the earmarks of our physical and material progress will be intelligibly upon the physical setting of our Canadian citizenship, and we shall live together in peace and harmony, vying with each other in the greatest contribution we can make to life; if we work together in harmony, in contentment and satisfaction, Canada will be the greatest nation the world has ever known. That is your responsibility; that is your duty, and I am with you to accomplish that great task. (Cheers, prolonged).

MR. DANA PORTER: Although in some respects, possibly, Mr. Bennett and our guest of today follow along different lines, nevertheless it must not be forgotten that the last words of Mr. Bennett's utterance at the Ottawa Conference were: We must be active in the defense of our institutions. We must put before all else our peace and happiness. (Applause).

We thank you, Sir, for what has been a most inspiring address, for something that is much more than a political speech, much more than an inaugural address. It is really a new expression of your philosophy of life and for this, Sir, we thank you, very, very much indeed.

MAKING A MINE IN CANADA

AN ADDRESS BY MR. JOHN E. HAMMELL

January 17, 1935

Before the Guest Speaker was introduced, the following motion was presented:

Moved by Mr. Spence,
Seconded by Mr. Fetherstonaugh,

> That, in view of the long association of the Most Reverend Archbishop Sweeney with The Empire Club, that he be made a Honourary Member.
>
> CARRIED.

In introducing Mr. Hammell, Mr. Dana Porter, the President of the Empire Club, referred to the fame of the Dionne quintuplets, but reminded the audience that Canada also had a famous pair of twins—Jack Hammell and Mining.

Mr. President, and Gentlemen: First, I must acknowledge the very kind remarks that your President has made in reference to myself.

What an influence the Empire Club has become, how truly democratic it is. It is a fine thing to see it in the hands of young, forward-looking Canadians, who are not only providing a great public forum, but carrying the various messages of distinguished men, myself excepted, from all parts of the world to thousands of Canadians and Americans by means of "Mysterious Mike" in front of me.

It was an inspiration to me to hear Mayor James Simpson last week before this Club. His message was an inspiring sample of straight Canadian thinking and perhaps brought us a little closer to the eternal truths of life. It is indeed a privilege to be asked to bring a message to the visible and invisible audience of The Empire Club.

Such an invitation could not be refused by anyone who is thinking of the future of this country, and I may say that I am not going to apologize for being here, nor admit that I am not accustomed to public speaking. Certainly my friends will admit that I am accustomed to private speaking, and if I speak as man to man I am sure you will forgive me the absence of oratorical phrases.

But that is not the point. I am glad to be able to say something in my humble way as the spokesman of that great, only partially developed half continent which we call The North. I regard myself simply as a deputy of the great army of my friends and co-workers in the North who, in the course of the last thirty years, have struggled to open the doors to the greater, the richer, the more happy and the truly magnificient Canada of the future.

I am not an economist, except as we all are more or less amateur economists in these days. But I will not pose as the man who interprets the economic trends of the mining industry in their various far-reaching relationships. That job is being done in a way I could not approach by such men as Hon. Wesley Gordon, the Hon. Charles McCrea, the Hon. Paul Leduc, and many others. They have dealt with the production figures of mining, the enormous strides the industry has made, and it is not difficult now to get up and juggle with some magnificient figures.

We can talk in billions about our own little backyard of Ontario extending from Sudbury and Cobalt to Kirkland Lake and Timmins. We can talk in hundreds of millions regarding annual gold production today as compared with twenty odd millions ten years ago.

To those eminent but somewhat blind public men and journalists who ask, "What has mining ever done for Canada?" I think the answer can be left to any travelling salesman, to the manufacturer of any kind of goods, to tens of thousands who are drawing wages or dividends, or to any boy in the senior grades of our schools—because, Gentlemen, you will find that Young Canada today has its eyes on the North, as the land of Hope and Glory, even as he stands on the street corners wondering what we are going to do about him.

And there is a job for us to do. There never was a more important moment in the history of Canada than just today, right now. That is why I am conscious of my obligation and my opportunity today. Canada, after four years of floundering, must buckle her belt and get going—for how can you whip ten million people who own the richest half continent in the world if they pull together.

But, Gentlemen, if we simply take the old methods and strive to build on that foundation I think even the most gifted and sincere statesmen are doomed to disappointment. Can we depend on wheat as we did in the first quarter of this century? Wheat is being grown successfully by nearly every nation that formerly imported it, and while our Canadian wheat will top the list for quality, I think it is apparent that short of famine or war, we must readjust our viewpoint on wheat or agriculture as the single basic factor in our future.

Can we put our faith in mass production? Today I am given to understand that we have the manufacturing plants to provide goods for a population several times as large as that of Canada. Can we displace the products of cheap labour countries in the markets of the world? I think not.

Can we depend upon secondary things such as organization and high finance, and food distribution and taking in one another's washing? I think we have passed the day for protecting monopolies which misuse power.

All the leaders in Canada—and I have listened to everything they have to say and I have been more or less familiar with them for a great many years—seem to think of only two classes of people—the farmers and the factory workers, entirely ignoring the real job of Canada on the Northern frontiers. I am a hundred percent with the farmers—I was born on a farm forty miles north of Toronto. The C.P.R. depot is on my father's farm —James Hammell's farm. I hope I live as long as he did—he died at ninety-one.

I have listened to Mr. Bennett in his speeches in which he says that he is going to form an Economic Council (I won't call it a 'Brain Trust'). Well, I can certainly urge Mr. Bennett, or anybody else who forms an Economic Council, that they had better get the Northerners and northern interests to take a leading place in that council, so that they may make a survey of the great areas of the Northland and adopt plans to make it a part—if not the greater part—of the constructive plan to build Canada positively by a greater development program.

Upon what do I base the conclusion that the North can save Canada? Well, I think you will agree that the North has been the lifeboat when the national ship seemed to be going on the rocks. The Northerner was the man who rowed the lifeboat out from the shore. He not only was ready to rescue the crew but he brought out the supplies in gold and other minerals which enabled the crew to survive while it was trying to weather the gale. We have been told that if we had been compelled to go out into the world to purchase gold with which to meet our international obligations and stand behind our currency, we would have been in a difficult position. The labour and products of thousands of Canadians would have had to go into the enormous amount necessary to buy gold in other markets. Then our nickel and copper have been great metals with which to patch the ship and constitute a high percentage of our export trade during depression years.

The influence of our mineral industry in saving the national ship is only one side of it. Mining has been giving employment to increasing thousands at high wages and making purchases of goods and machinery during all the years of depression. It has been one sure anchor for the ship.

Now that I have that off my chest, Gentlemen, I will tell you something about the North country.

Away back in the early days when the prospectors were first going into the North, two prospectors came to me—Tom Creighton and Dan Mosher. They wanted to prospect for me. I said, "Well, I am going to take you boys on a five year program—win, lose or draw. I don't care what you do with the money; spend it in liquor if you like; but if you can afford to spend five years of your life, I can shoot the money. If you will do the prospecting, I will look after you; also finance and develop any find you may make, and cut you in on it." They said, "We'll get you something." Well, they did. They went up to The Pas, in Northern Manitoba, went to the bush from there and later on in the season I got word they had found a gold property. I immediately went West. Mrs. Hammell cut herself in on the trip. We went to The Pas, got a boat there, and after two days and two nights' travel we arrived at Sturgeon Landing. The first portage was eighteen miles, and it was the first portage Mrs. Hammell had made. We left at four o'clock in the morning and arrived at noon. The prospectors were there. I expected to paddle across the lake but we paddled until evening, then put into an island, built a fire, and boiled the kettle. After a couple of hours, we started hooking water again. Dan Mosher said, "Jack, do you see that light up there? That is where we are going." Well, we kept hooking water for three hours more and I asked Dan, "Are you sure that that light isn't on the back of an automobile going the other way?"

Well, we got in at midnight. It was a long day for Mrs. Hammell—from four in the morning until twelve at night.

I went in and took a look at Wolverine Lake. It didn't look so hot. There was some gold but nothing you could tie into. They said they had a sulphide deposit and if it were near the railway it would be a wonderful thing. I said, "Let me see some samples." They produced the samples. I looked them over and I said that they looked as if there might be some copper and gold in them. A couple of young engineers from Colorado, on a nearby property, had some assaying equipment so I had them run some assays and in the assays we found it ran in copper and gold. I said, "You go and stake this. I will scoot up the lake with Mrs. Hammell and get in a little fishing for a couple of weeks." In two weeks, Mrs. Hammell and I went in for a look-see. We had to make fourteen portages, from half a mile to three miles. I sized it up and said, "Boys, how much money do you want to make you happy for life," They said, "Jack, give us a hundred thousand dollars apiece and Rockefeller can have the rest." I said, "Well, I'll get it for you." They thought I was crazy. Then I recorded the claims and started to shoot a few wires around. When I got down here I went right through to New York and there were several big outfits gunning for it. I tried to spar around and get a line on them all, and I finally picked out one outfit which I figured was the best.

Then, I had to do a little four-flushing for once in my life. There are a lot of things you have to do in the mining game. I was stopping at the Vanderbilt Hotel. You know, in Wall Street, if they think you are broke, they twist your head off and run away and hide it. My friend the Hotel Manager said, "Jack, why don't you take Reggie Vanderbilt's suite? Knock them dead, it won't cost you anything." Well, I took the suite, and when these gentlemen came to see me they went to the clerk of the hotel and they said, "Does Mr. Hammell stay here?" "Do you mean Mr. Hammell who has his own apartment here?" was the reply, and they were hurried to the elevator by a uniformed man and taken up to the floor, where there were two more butlers around with uniforms on. They started to look around and said, "This baby is *some* prospector!" Then I came out, nonchalantly, and at a signal, one of the waiters wheeled up "the makings." They thought they were going to stick us; everybody asked for a digerent cocktail; but we had them. Then we went into the dining room and had an elaborate dinner. I know—for I paid for it after they got through. Then we came into the living room and I let them smoke some of my dollar cigars, after the liqueurs and coffee, after which I condescended to talk to them.

The result was that I put through a deal for three million dollars, for three-fourths interest, which involved the putting in of a 100-mile railroad, smelter machinery and equipment, and developing a water power sixty-five miles from the property—costing $6,500,000 alone. They said, "We will have to confirm this." I said, "You can't confirm it. You will have to take my word for it. We will have to put the diamond drills in and you will have to wait." They still wanted confirmation and I said, "Grab the phone, use the long distance wire, or telegraph—anybody you like—the mining companies or the banks." Evidently I had a lot of friends here because we put the deal through the next day.

Then I had to go up to the property. I went to The Pas; had to break a road in a hundred miles and drag all the stuff in. We drilled it and after we had spent $50,000 there was a payment coming due which they did not feel they could meet and, unfortunately, I was in the bush. Any time they spend more money on my property I will keep them going. One of my partners, a solicitor, threw the deal and now I had to work it up all over again. I was in pretty good shape. I had kept the data of their engineers; I had the samples and all their maps. I could take their own data and go out and work again. I took it up with another crowd; they spent several hundred thousand dollars and again they pulled out; which was all the luck of the trail. I took their data and went down to New York and went to William B. Thompson—I can speak of him now he is gone, he was a big man and in three quarters of an hour I put through a deal, the same as the first deal practically. He said that his engineers know nothing about that country and would not know how to get the stuff in. I said, "You leave that to me, I'll get it in." I cut across to Chicago, then to The Pas again, rounded up all the Pas merchants and said, "We're going to buy everything for your shopkeepers here and don't you push it above ten per cent on cost price." By the time the engineers got in, I had purchased two mining plants and enough stuff for 118 men for 8 months shipped in. It astonished the engineers to see ten tons of bacon, ten tons of ham, and all that, but they didn't have too much before they got through.

I purchased one plant from the Prince Albert Company at Beaver Lake. There were some fine old fellows who owned that property and they thought they had me on the hip. I offered $10,000 for the plant and they wanted $15,000. They kept waiting around for about ten days and the break-up was on. One of them said, "You haven't much chance of getting the plant in, we'll take $10,000." In delivering the receipt I said, "I want to tell you something, you old stiffs, that plant has been on the property and steam up for two weeks." One old fellow was very hostile and was going to have the law on me. One of the old merchants said, "Hold on, we thought we had this young fellow but he outsmarted us so forget it." So finally they went home the next day, happy and satisfied. You can't wait for anything in the North. You have to keep going or you'll never get anywhere.

Later on, we had to fight an election in order to get a railway in. The Premier of Manitoba said, "You have to get Mr. So-and-So in here or you won't get your railway." The Manitoba Government was in pretty bad through the Separate School question. Anyway, the poor Provincial Treasurer couldn't get a seat. I dissolved the Liberal and the Conservative Association and formed the Northland Association, and in putting this man up I said, "You get around and shake hands, and don't be so high-hat with those people. Leave this to me. Just make a good fighting speech and show them you are two-fisted. That's what they like up here." We had a hard time in this way—we had to fight the O.B.U. who told the voters if we won this election we were going to divide up the stock of the Boothe Fisheries, Hudson's Bay Company, and everybody else. We got the Indians, the half-breeds and everybody else; and all kinds of religions; and we won the election and made our opponent lose his deposit. We had thirty-four nuns and all the priests but one, to whom I said "Lay off, Father, you can't vote, you are an American."

Later on, when I went into the property again, through The Pas Board of Trade we took in seventy-three people—the head men of Winnipeg—the Farmer Government (and if you think those farmers in the Middle West are hicks, you are fooled; they are plenty smart). We put them in canoes—some of them had never been in a canoe before—and it was plenty rough. It took us two days and a night to make the trip. However, that resulted in our getting a railway, which we had to have in that country.

I will say it was a little hard out there, with a Farmer Government which knew nothing about mining, to show them what mining would mean to their country. Well, I give them credit. They were broad enough, and smart enough, to realize what mining means to the other industries of a country. And I had the pleasure, not very long ago, in the Ritz-Carlton Hotel in Montreal, of having Honorable Mr. Bracken, the present Premier of Manitoba, say, "Mr. Hammell, when are you going to come back to Manitoba? I wish you would come. There is nothing we won't do for you. The only bright spot we have is that development you were responsible for in our north country." That is very gratifying, and they are doing a great work up there today. They have a town up there now. It is not like the old days when you had to mush over the trail with a dog sled. Now it is a real live city—the third city in Manitoba. It is a nice town, and prosperous, and that town has grown up, you might say, overnight. We have lovely towns in the east; they take many years to build; but the building of a mining town shows how fast the North country grows. We have one Flin Flon. There are plenty more to be found.

Now, after that job, I coasted along with prospecting parties and finally I got a long distance phone call one night saying that a new find had been made in Northern Ontario and the Howey boys wanted me to go up and look at it. My answer was that I was too busy, had too many things on, but they said, "Look, we have paddled two days and nights to bring this to you" so I said, "What have you got?" They said, "Something pretty good." I said, "What do you want for it?" and they said, "Never mind, write your own ticket."

I took Alex Gillies and went in (he was one of the discoverers of the Hollinger); another tough little kid, Cooney Wood, went along with us and he collected samples for me. I took a look at the property and liked it, but I said to Gillies, "It doesn't look so hot, but you might as well sample while we are here." He sampled and in the meantime I was busy grabbing off all the ground I could. I got busy with the Government for a water power forty miles away—Mr. McCrea will bear me out in that. I came out and had the deal closed before I got the results of the essays of the samples. The results were all right. We went ahead. We went to the Government and asked for the loan of aeroplanes. We had to get our stuff in quick or lose a year. The Government was good enough to furnish aeroplanes and that was the first time aeroplanes had been used for transportation of men and supplies to a mine. We went ahead and spent some $50,000 and I had another large mining company take an option on the company. They diamond drilled, spent some money, but it didn't look so good to them and as a result they threw it back on my lap, which was tough —150 miles from the railway—a big company turning it down. I went to the brokers and said, "How can I finance this?" I went to the Financial Editor of the Globe and to some other men. He said that it would take six months to finance. I said that I was going to finance it in two days or throw it in the lake. In two days I not only had it subscribed, I had it over-subscribed. That was tough too—I had to throw the rest of the money back! We went ahead with the property and she has turned out all right today. Today we have a very good low grade mine, with cheap mining costs, although it is 150 miles in the bush.

Now, another thing people ask is, "What has mining done for Canada?" There is a little property which took $2,000,000 to equip and develop. Our friends and supporters, and shareholders, put in $2,000,000. We produced $5,000,000—$7,000,000 in all, and out of that the shareholders have received ten per cent dividends in one year, after waiting ten years. $6,500,000 has gone to the benefit of the farmers, the manufacturers, everybody in Canada. That is what one little mine has done for Canada. (Applause.) Today, up in that district, we have a hundred kiddies going to school. I think they are trying to make a touch on me to build a high school for them.

You have to have optimism in this game. It is a great deal like the story of the prospector who died and wanted to go to Heaven. He went to Heaven and St. Peter opened the door. He said, "This is Baptiste. Is it all right to come in?" St. Peter said, "No, Baptiste, the place is all filled up. We can't take any more prospectors." Then Baptiste said to St. Peter, "If I can get a prospector to come out, can I come in?" St. Peter said, "Sure, there will be room for you then." So St. Peter opened the door and let Baptiste in and he started to the tell the boys about a wonderful gold find in Hades. He got them all worked up and they started to rush out, slinging their packsacks over their backs and grabbing their picks. They were all rushing out and at the end of the line came little Baptiste.

St. Peter said, "But you don't need to go now, Baptiste." Baptiste said, "But if I don't go, the boys will beat me to it." "But," said St. Peter, "that was only fictitious. You were just kidding those fellows." And Baptiste said, "Never mind, Peter, you never can tell about these rushes." (Laughter).

That is the sort of optimism they have. I will say here that we have ten thousand prospectors in the North country who can't be beaten. These fellows are two-fisted he-men, ready to take a chance, night or day, fighting water, ice and snow, flies and all that, and keeping going. I will say that they do not all find something but they all do their part, which is a fine thing.

Now, through this one little mine getting its supplies taken in by Government aeroplanes, it gave me the idea of what we could do in the North country if we had a fleet of aeroplanes, and finally something constructive came out of the idea. I formed an exploration company and got a bunch of aeroplanes and a hundred prospectors. I paid the prospectors $150 a month, all expenses, and ten percent of what they found. I put them in planes and carried them around—petted them, I might say. I had a tough time getting them in the planes at first; they were a little afraid; they were the ouiji board kind, they wanted to have one foot on the ground.

I was down in New York with Captain Oaks and I conceived the idea of flying up in one of our new planes. He said, "Let's go!" Mrs. Oaks and Mrs. Hammell came up from New York to Montreal and we flew out through the West. The result was that the old fellows decided that if we took a chance with our wives, they guessed it was all right. After that we had no more trouble. In fact, we had trouble keeping them out. They would only get set and they wanted to move.

Through the planes, we established thirty-four bases from coast to coast—plane depots and gas caches—and we had an engineer in charge of every plane with ten men.

In that way, we continued to push through the North country and if we had never made a find still it was a wonderful thing because we brought that country ahead a hundred years at least. We made one find that will, I think, more than pay back all we have spent. I had visions of going to New York to finance the aviation unit but I let my friends know and they put in a million and a half dollars. That was pretty nice. They were mining friends who had known me for twenty years. Th result is that that has been coming back, in this way: When we had shot a million and a half dollars in the exploration company, we had no more funds. It was up to me to carry it and I have been doing so for three years. I couldn't go back and ask for more, and I am happy to say that they will get their investment back and a profit.

Another thing I have been struck with, is the youth of the country. I don't know how many hundred letters I get from young fellows wanting to go North. We try to take care of all the young fellows but I am afraid that Professor Haultain would say that we don't take care of enough of them. That is why I say people should get behind these young fellows and send them North. It takes $3,000 to educate them, why not spend another $1,000. Let them go to the Prospectors' Association and get in touch with a good, honest prospector. There are many of them who would be glad to have a young fellow go along with them.

I know when I go down to New York and get mixed up with the chisellers, I always feel it in my mind—I think that everybody is wrong and I always want to shake everything. But I get up in the North country for a week and it is all straightened away, and you think what a fine and wonderful country it is to live in. You have a different feeling, and if you come across anyone who is antagonistic, you rather pity him.

In the Northern Aerial Minerals Exploration Limited we made a find that looked to be pretty good, but the depression was on. We spent $100,000 in development, putting down drill holes and opening up the surface. It looked pretty good. I was unsuccessful in interesting anybody in it. I tried all the companies — Canadian, American and English—and they were all looking out the window. The result was, they made me mad. I said that I was going to shoot it myself. I started to spend some money and I brought a couple of engineers up from New York. On the way up I said, "I don't want to waste time taking you old birds in here. You're burned out. You couldn't recommend a property a hundred miles in the bush." They got better assays and they wanted to shoot $50,000. I said, "That's only a white chip. I'm going to shoot $150,000 myself." They got my dander up and I said I was going to shoot half a million—win, lose or draw. Even if I lost, I was going to shoot it. When it got over $100,000 my friends came into the picture and were glad to come in and help finance it. The property not only lived up to what I expected but turned out very nicely.

I want to say that no finer bunch of people than the Canadian people are to be found when it comes to backing mining enterprises. At the top, some of them are not so good — they are traders in Brazil or in some other foreign country—but the majority of people you get are more confident in the North country than in foreign countries.

And I want to say that we have as good engineers in Canada as anywhere in the world, probably for this reason: We are bringing in so many new mines and it means the latest in metallurgy, in mining, and in mining machinery. The American engineers come in and the cork is pulled, for the reason they are used to their mines which pinch out at the water level, as they do in many cases. I flew out for some holidays in Los Angeles. It was a holiday but, being a mining man, I heard of the strike in the Silver Queen mine and I had to go out and look it over. A young man high-hatted me for a minute but he eventually took me through the mine. It looked good but right around it I remembered that there were three mines with mills shut down. It looked like the water plane was cutting them out. Here, it is different; our mines don't cut out.

I was up in Kirkland Lake and had the pleasure of looking at the assay plans of one of the big mines and I tell you the section between 4,000 and 5,000 feet was the greatest ore the boys had in that mine. Think of it! A large mining town and still going. You can't bottom the mine. You can't salvage them. They are still going. In 1915 they were going to close the Dome. Today it is a better mine than ever. Noranda, Timmins and all these places are great towns. How long are they going to last, you hear people ask. Timmins hasn't started to get its growth yet. I remember Noranda quite a few years ago, and when I flew over it not long ago I didn't know the place. The towns of Noranda and Rouyn are two big, rich towns. And so it goes, no matter where we go in the North country. I venture to say that in ten years it will be increased by ten times. This year we have made more new finds than in the last twenty years. During the boom years the prospectors were starting to get soft. They were doing their prospecting from the rooms of the hotels —staking "cats" for racketeers. I don't mean the regular brokers. I'm talking about the chisellers and the vermin who followed mining—they didn't care what, so long as they could unload it on somebody.

When the depression came, the prospector had to get up and drag his tail to the bush, or he wasn't going to eat. That is why we are getting so many finds.

Now, when you fly over this great land, you see new towns growing into cities. Millions spent for mines. You can see towns like Timmins, Noranda, Flin Flon, Howey, Central Pat and Pickle Crow in the Patricia district; Siscoe, Lamaque and many others.

Now, in regard to opening the North country—and I am qualified to speak for I have been responsible for a hundred million dollars coming into Canada — I have slugged for twenty years on the trail—I say that none of the Governments have been awake to the fact of what that North country means. Here we are today; right where we are standing our forefathers had to clear the timber off the land before they could put in their crops, to say nothing of Indians as a pastime. We don't do that now; we're getting too soft. Take this country of ours. We have only developed the fringe. Look at all the cities we have—we have never gone North. What's the matter? Are we afraid of getting lost? Take the North country—there are the Hollingers, the Lake Shores and the Domes, and all those properties there—lots of them. We haven't started to find anything yet. We will be finding new mines a hundred years from now. We need help. The prospectors need help. There should be some way to do it. Take the farmers; when it gets tough with them, the Government gives them a bonus. That is fine, I'm all for it. But did you ever hear of them giving us a bonus when we get beaten and washed out? We don't want a bonus; we get along without it. But they should try to open the country. We have parallel roads stretching from coast to coast. We have practically no railways in the North. We haven't any roads. I daresay that a road would pay for itself many times over if you put it where the rocks and timber are. That is one thing that is lacking in this country. That is one thing we have to waken to. I hear them telling how they are going to pull out of this slump. I want to see them do it.

Well, Gentlemen, I hope I have not rambled too much. I have a subject which could not be covered in a dozen speeches. I hope other Northern men will be asked to speak to you. Many of them will have a better speech than mine, but I can only assure you that I speak from the heart.

I shall never forget the words of Ramsay Macdonald in one of his speeches. Someone had referred to him as a dreamer. He admitted it but said, "Yes, a dreamer!

We dream of things and if we are men of action we set about the doing of them in our waking moments."

Well, we are awake. We all dream of a greater Canada. Then in the name of the heritage which Providence has given us, let us set about the doing of the great job our Creator intended us to do. He did not give us this half continent to build a race of weaklings or to leave it for other races to develop. We don't want our sons to turn into bitter defeated men and our daughters to look in vain for men like their fathers and grandfathers.

Nature has unfolded our job, chapter by chapter. First, the homebuilders, the pioneers of Ontario, Quebec and the Maritimes. Then the pioneering of the West. And now the North. Let's drop our petty enmities and the things that don't matter. I've worked hard but I've enjoyed every bit of it. I feel that I owe something to Canada, so that I can leave it after some bit of constructive service, to those who will come after. That's how we feel. We want to build a new Canada on new firm foundations. I say to you the strongest material for these foundations are the Pre-Cambrian rocks of the North—the oldest in the world. Let's get a plan and start!

And I say to you right here that any Government—Conservative, Liberal or C.C.F.—that leaves the North out of its national planning—planning that must be done—is not fit to govern this country. Whether we know it or not, we have to become North-minded, and this goes for Governments, business men, and every one worthy to call himself a Canadian.

Gentlemen, there is more to this life than a mad scramble for dollars. Let's mine the rich viens of character in youth as well as the viens of gold in our mines. Let's make this country the finest place in the world to build manly men and fine women. With a Northern plan we can do it, Gentlemen, and our work for young Canada will be our monument.

Gentlemen, I thank you. (Hearty Applause).

MR. DANA PORTER: It is not the custom of this Club to have a vote of thanks proposed but I am going to make an exception and ask the Honourable Charles McCrea to express appreciation to the speaker today.

HONOURABLE CHARLES McCREA: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: The history of Canada is replete with the deeds of men who have laid deeply and truly the foundations of this great country. In the days which have passed the prosperity of Canada was laid mainly upon two great basic industries—agriculture and timber—but we have moved into a new era and we are beginning to recognize the importance of the development of our great mineral areas in this country. We are blessed with a heritage that few if any nations in the world can compare and in this development there is need of men of courage, enthusiasm and inspiration to lead in the advance of that development.

Today, you have heard Mr. Jack Hammell, one of Canada's outstanding prospectors and mining men — a man who we may truly say is a leader and a great pioneer in this development. Many times has the enthusiasm, the courage and the determination of Jack Hammell saved the day in the development of mineral areas and if we have in our sister provinces today the development of a new mining industry already producing some ten millions per annum and employing ten thousand men, we can truly say that Jack Hammell played a part, a leading part, in the foundation upon which that great development has started and as we move west to a region which is coming more and more into prominence, the Red Lake district, there, too, we see the imprint of the work of Jack Hammell, in starting and standing behind the Howey Mine. Jack has still other ventures further north in the district of Patricia where beside Central Patricia a new, prosperous looking baby, Pickle Crow, gives promise of leading in the van in this section.

Over in the Province of Quebec and strewn all along this great Pre-Crambrian shield, one finds the mark of Jack Hammell and today, Gentlemen, you have listened to one of the great pioneer prospectors and builders of Canada and on your behalf, I tender to him our deepest appreciation and thanks, not only for the speech he has given us today, but for the work he has already done, for the part he has played in the development of Canada's mineral resources. Here is good luck to him; may he continue to prospect, and may he continue to lead. Gentlemen, I present to Mr. Hammell, on your behalf, the thanks of this group today and I would ask you to rise and join me in three cheers for a great pioneer—Jack Hammell. (Three Cheers—Applause, prolonged).

WHAT IS THE CAUSE OF WAR

AN ADDRESS BY JOHN STRACHEY

January 24, 1935

MR. DANA PORTER, the President of the Club, introduced the Speaker, as follows: I venture to say that at least 99 per cent of those who are attending this meeting are either capitalists or people who aspire to become capitalists in due course. Nevertheless, just as law-abiding and highly respectable people will read murder mystery stories without ever intending or having any desire to commit a murder, so people of the capitalistic class will come out to hear one who is not only a Socialist but from what he informs me, I take it that he might not be insulted if he is called a Communist.

There are other reasons of course that will explain your presence here today. One of them is that we have lately been nursed into the belief that the capitalistic system requires regulation, so that there might be a slightly more receptive audience for opinions which may appear on the face of them, extreme.

In the second place, Mr. Strachey is known as the most effective and the most eloquent exponent of the doctrines of Socialism, who is writing and speaking at the present day. He is known as being a member of a most eminent literary family whose works and whose publications are familiar to everybody here, and he has carried on the tradition of literary expression which has been the gift of those to whom he is related. It is with great pleasure that I call upon Mr. Strachey.

MR. JOHN STRACHEY addressed the gathering as follows: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen: I experience here this afternoon to the full those emotions with which Daniel entered the den on a famous occasion; but I may say that I go further than Daniel because so far as I know there is no Scriptural authority for saying that Daniel actually addressed the lions, but I am going to attempt even that feat. Speaking of Daniel, if I am Daniel in the Lion's Den, you have in this country a far more eminent Daniel in the sense of a "Daniel who has come to judgment" (Amusement) in the leader of this country. I read with raised eye brows expressions from the political leader of this country, Mr. Bennett, of harsh criticism of the capitalistic system, such as when I ventured to utter when I was last in the Dominion of Canada in the autumn of 1933 sent shivers I notice through my audience and made them feel that I was laying myself open to heavy pangs and penalties.

However, this change in the view of the capitalistic system, which those in authority appear to have had does not in my opinion mean that Mr. Bennett will or the rest of his supporters will work for the abolition of this system. He has never of course suggested that. It does not even in my view mean he will be able, at any rate in any important particular, to modify that system. And there I think that we do come to an important point because it bears very directly on the subject which you ask me to speak on this afternoon—"The Cause of Modern War."

Now I am not going to attempt any profound psychological or philosophical study of the causes of all war: I am not qualified to make any such study. I am going to confine my remarks to what appear to be to all of us the causes of modern war, that is to say, what seems to have caused the last war and what I am bound to say seems so very rapidly to be about to cause the next war, or is causing the astonishing preparations for a new armed conflict, which we in Europe feel so very intimately. You are slightly more distant from the scene of maximum tension in the world today, though all the world is in a state of very great tension: you are comparatively near the centre of tension in the Pacific, but we in Europe have our own centre in Central Europe itself in which the preparations for a new war are very far advanced indeed.

During this autumn, twice at any rate—in September after the murder of Chancellor Dolfuss in Austria and then later in the autumn after the assassination of King Alexander and Messieur Barthou in Marseilles, we got very near war. I read a very well informed article in the New York press by a well informed correspondent, Mr. Walter Duranty, in which he was giving us, as it were, a message of encouragement for the New Year, in which he said he did not think any war was coming, and the argument he used was this, that Europe had been on at least two occasions on the very brink of war and no war had taken place, and therefore it might not take place on any future occasion of the same sort. I find that very cold comfort; it is like saying a patient had been twice at death's door and that he had not actually died, and may be he would pull through the next time too. Of course he may, but again he may not; and I don't find any great reassurance in that.

What I want to ask today is, Why? Why can it be that today, so near historically to the cessation of the last great war, the Powers of this world, the great states, are so near once again to the outbreak of a new war? Because whatever view we may take, we can not doubt that they are all piling up armaments with gigantic speed: that the States of Europe, each of them are terribly distressed by the economic crisis, finding their budgets unbalanced, overburdened as they are, yet at the risk and necessity of unbalancing those budgets still more, piling enormous burdens of taxation on their people, still are going ahead with vast armament preparation everywhere in Europe today. It is a very extraordinary situation, is it not, and one which proves that in the opinion of those governments they are very near to war once more. How can this be? How can it be that the capitalistic rulers of the world, the classes of persons and the governments which represent them, which control effectively the policy of all capitalistic states today, that they are preparing for a new war? You would think that it would be the last thing which they would do, for surely if the capitalistic system is in danger it is more in danger from outbreak of war than from anything else! One would imagine that the tremendous damage which a modern war does to the structure of every State, which it does to the vanquished and even to the victors as we saw in the last war, there is the thing above all which might create revolution and the over-throw of existing forms of government. We saw that work in the Russian Revolution itself, sprung from the last war; the German revolution, the Austrian Revolution or the upheavals in Europe, some successful, some unsuccessful, sprung from the last war, so you would have thought that in their own interests of self-preservation the capitalist classes of the world would be loath to go back to war. Yet, for some reason or other, somehow or other, we find them apparently rushing on to their doom.

It is a very extraordinary question, and how can we answer it? We believe that the capitalistic system is of such a nature—and this nature can be illustrated and explained by economic analysis—that it is impossible in modern conditions of very great productivity for all the capitalistic states of the world, to achieve any lasting or permanent degree of recovery (putting it in a grossly over-simplified way, for that is all one can do in the brief limits of an after-luncheon speech) we believe that for comprehensible reasons the market for commodities in the world has become too small, as it were, to go around: that because the system is of such a nature that the vast majority of the population in every capitalistic state has to be kept on a minimum standard of life, every nation as its productivity becomes large, as it becomes industrialized, as it becomes ultra capitalistic, has to turn outwards for new markets.

And this in essence is the process which we observe. In the past this was possible. The number of developed industrial states was not very great. England was the first, and it was only gradually followed by others; and on the other hand there were large areas of the world in an undeveloped condition which would serve as markets. But that is no longer the case today. On the one hand, it is not just one or two but a dozen highly developed industrial producers, of which I think it is true to say that this country—the Dominion of Canada—is one today itself, in its own right I would say a very highly developed industrial state, and it will in the future at any rate find itself more and more thrust into this world-wide struggle for markets, and it is this struggle we believe which is, at the bottom of the whole process, driving the capitalistic states of the world back towards war, because each of them finds it can only achieve salvation for itself at the expense of its rivals. And as this is a life and death matter, as this is something without which the capitalistic system in each particular country cannot continue to exist, this life and death matter can only be settled in life and death struggles.

And it is for this reason, here and now today (whatever the reasons that may be in human nature for war) the actual reason why war is so obviously coming upon us again today is the struggle for markets. It includes of course a struggle for raw materials and other economic advantages, but markets is the essence of it.

Now that leads me back to the question of whether it is possible to modify this capitalist system today in such a way that this difficulty of the competitive search for markets—competitive struggle for markets would be a better word—whether this can be obviated, and at the same time the other difficulties of the system, the crises into which it falls from time to time and from which it is only so painfully and so partially emerging today, bring them before us—is it possible to alter the system so that these very terrible evils of crises and war do not assail us, without abolishing it, because I take it that is the object of the various reform policies which we see in the world today. The original of course was Mr. Roosevelt's "New Deal" in the United States, but Mr. Roosevelt has now found his imitators. In Great Britain we have Mr. Lloyd George announcing a "New Deal," and Mr. Bennett doing the same thing here. If we strip off the somewhat elaborate propaganda which these efforts are necessarily launched with, what do we find in the content of these efforts to reform the system? What do they really try to do and what do they promise to do? What they promise to do when you get down to brass tacks: they promise to redistribute purchasing power, to give the non-capitalist elements of the community a bigger amount of purchasing power so that they can get a bigger supply of commoditites, which is very nice for them obviously, and which also, looking at it economically, would solve the difficulties of the system, because of course if you could build up a market at home by giving more people access to the products of industry, then the struggle for foreign markets need never take place, and in the same way crises need never take place; it need never come to the point it came to in '29 when the capitalists of the world could not sell their products, if they could give the workers of the world more purchasing power. That, I venture to say, when the "ballyhoo" is stripped off, is the object of the "New Deal."

Now is that possible? Is it possible, without altering the system, by leaving the means of production, as the economists call it, in private hands, and leaving the operation of those instruments to the motive of private profit, is it possible to distribute purchasing power? I am not going to go into any abstruse economic argument on the subject, but I would ask you to watch the progress of New Deals as they develop—and the oldest of them, the New Deal from Washington, is nearly two years old and we are in a position where we can study what is happening there. I was very interested in the figures given by Mr. Donald Richberg, the leading official of the N.R.A. now, as to what actually had happened to the purchasing power during the first year of the New Deal. If you will remember, that New Deal was launched with a very definite promise that it would raise wages by putting in wage minima and generally increasing the standard of life of the population, and as I read your Prime Minister's speches, that also is part of his object, partly achieved by wage minima, partly by the institution of social services. It does not matter how you distribute the purchasing power, as far as this economic system is concerned, whether it is done by wages, insurance and pensions, or what it is: the problem will be solved if you can really give people more buying power.

Well, what has happened in this ambitious attempt to get over this fatal crux of the system? Mr. Richberg, speaking last August, if you will remember—I will just recall the figures to you, you are probably familiar with them—was able to show that wages, the average level of United States wages had been raised under the New Deal—it had been raised 8.5% to be precise, and there apparently was at any rate some step towards the achievement of this objective. But then he went on to discuss further figures, and the next figure he gave was that prices had been raised 9.6%—and those are cost-of-living, prices, prices of necessaries, and therefore by simple arithmetic we were left to the conclusion that purchasing power, far from being raised, had actually been diminished 1.10%. And that is a very significant and serious feature of the opening stages of the New Deal: apparently for some reason it had proved quite impossible even to move an inch towards this objective of the New Deal, of any effort to reform the system in the distributing of purchasing power, and the net result had been a decrease of purchasing power.

The Chairman has informed me that I am addressing an audience of capitalists and would-be-capitalists, and I think therefore they will understand and appreciate clearly the next point which I make. I don't really think it is difficult to understand why the New Deal had to result in that diminution instead of increase of purchasing power, because I put it to every business man here present: what would have happened if, in the America of 1933, all that had been done had been that increase of wages of 8.5%? If simply in the spring of '33, the Government had put minimum wage legislation, arbitrarily raised the level of American wages by 8.5%, and done nothing else? Well of course every one of you will agree with me, American industry, as it was then, would have simply come to a stop: it was running at a loss as it was. Again Mr. Richberg's figures show that American industry was running 6.9% in the red. If you had simply raised wages and done nothing else you would have increased the costs of every industry already making a loss, already in serious difficulties, and you would have simply sunk the whole system; profits already minimum, already a minus, would have become an enormous minus; there would have been an enormous deficit, and you would simply have sunk the system.

And therefore the New Deal, not only raised wages but raised, by a variety of devices, prices as well. It had these various clauses of the New Deal for an increase in prices, by cartelization, agreements of every sort, and of course and above all by the devaluation of the dollar, by monetary means prices were raised; and the net result was a decrease in costs in American industry, because prices were raised more than wages. And that was perfectly sound capitalistic policy, which made possible the degree of revival, perhaps not very great, but the degree of revival which has taken place in the United States; but it entirely prevented any possibility of carrying out the promises of the New Deal, which was an increase in purchasing power to the workers.

Now I submit to you, but of course very crudely and tersely as I put it here, that is the fundamental dilemma which faces any of these attempts to alter the nature of the system. The attempts to reform the capitalistic system are never undertaken when that system is strong and could stand new burdens put upon it. It would have been quite possible in the boom years—in the 1920's I have no doubt it would have been quite possible to raise wages, or to put an increased burden of taxation for social services upon the system. The rate of profit was high enough to put that upon the system. But when capitalism is strong, it never thinks of reform. It is when it is in difficulties—and this is no accusation against the capitalists, it is only human nature—it is when the system is in difficulties that it turns (as Mr. Bennett has turned today) to a programme of reform: it is just when it is in difficulties, when it is impossible for it to stand extra burdens for the reform, it is when the rate of profit is low that the rate of profit must be raised and not lowered, if there is to be any hope of revival, any hope of reform; and I am afraid that the contradiction between revival and reform is the thing which most seriously jeopardizes and renders impossible any real attempt to alter the system.

I am not going to say that it is impossible to patch it here or there. That has been carried to a good long way in Great Britain; the system of social services no doubt has kept the system going for some little time. Whether in the very different conditions of the New World a similar system can be built up at all remains to be seen, but even if it can be, I do not think that the elaborate system of social services which has taken 25 years to develop in Great Britain has altered the nature of the system in any way or got it out of its difficulties.

You hear a great deal about a great revival in Great Britain at the present moment. There is a considerable revival in the figures which British industry is able to show, but it is worth while to remember that the level of Unemployment is still well over double what it was in 1929—that in spite of that revival you have double the number of British workers definitely excluded from the productive field. So I don't think the British experience gives us any warrant for believing that the institution of social services makes any fundamental modification in the system.

And therefore I believe that we shall, as these various New Deals in one country after another work themselves out, we shall find that seriously we have to make the choice of putting up with the system as it is, and with all it means by way of prices and war, or of abolishing it altogether and instituting the opposite type of system. I believe that the operation of the new deals, their success or failure, is decisive in this respect. Mr. Maynard Keynes made that point. I do not very often find myself in agreement with Mr. Maynard Keynes' statements, but I was in agreement with that one. He said the New Deal (referring to the American one, and the same might be said of the Canadian) was the definitive attempt to reform the Capitalistic system, and if and when it failed, and showed that the system was left unmodified, then we were left with the choice of the System as it is and as we have known it and its total abolition and dissolution on the antithetical basis of Public Ownership and Production for Profit. That is the most important meaning I think of these efforts at reform which come out under the pressure of events in one country after another. It is quite inevitable I think that such reforms should be undertaken but I do not believe that their results will be anything but negative.

And therefore, speaking as I am so conscious of doing to a capitalist audience, I do most seriously ask you, not to be convinced—I know that is quite beyond the bounds of possibility—by what I am saying today, but to watch, to bear in mind my hints of today and to watch what happens during the next months and the next few years, and most seriously to consider if what I say is true, if it does turn out that nothing which can be done to the System seriously alters its nature, whether even your interests are still bound up with preserving this system. I suggest to you that the way Capitalism is working out in the world today, I believe to be utterly intolerable for the working class, but I believe it to be none too jolly for the captalist class either. There are some persons for whom it is not so bad. I realize that very well. But I suggest to you that is a rapidly diminishing number of persons; that capitalism is not only dispossessing millions and hundreds of millions of workers today, but it is dispossessing thousands or at any rate hundreds of capitalists today: that the whole tendency of this system, along with the drive to war, is also to the concentration of capital, the building up of larger and larger and fewer and fewer masses of capital in fewer and fewer hands, and that therefore the number of persons whose real interests are most bound up with this system becomes slowly but surely ever smaller. And beyond that purely economic consideration, there is surely this consideration of war. If it does turn out—and there again I am asking you to study the development of events in order to convince yourselves—if it does turn out that this system is bound up with war, then war is not such a jolly thing for anybody, the capitalist class of the world in the broadest sense, not just the few people at the very top, I am not speaking of them, but broadly the rest of us are all hit about equally by war, and modern war is going to be something, and in a war of the future, something which will make the little affair of 1914-1918 into a kind of border skirmish. There is no doubt that what is coming in the way of war will be something quite beyond anything which we have imagined.

Therefore, it does seem to me that it is worth all our while today to study real carefully the real situation of the world because capitalism is working out in such a way today that it is threatening, not merely the interests but actually the life of every class in the community, not merely of the working class. The conflicts, the social conflicts as well as the international conflicts, which capitalism produces are very great and of course passions are very strongly aroused, and I know very well the tremendous pressure which is put on all of us to join those forces which are determined at all costs to preserve the capitalist system. But before we throw in our lot with that side, I do think we should bear in mind these considerations. Let us at any rate approach the problem with reason rather than with passion.

There is a statement here which I would just like to read to you, from an eminent American citizen which expresses what I feel to be the wrong way to approach these questions, the approach of passion, the approach which is bound to produce the most violent conflicts, both within nations and between nations. It is an appeal to the formation upon the basis of passion of the widest front, of persons who desire to maintain the capitalist system, and as you will see when I say who uttered this statement they are not only capitalists in the ordinary sense of the word. This is what this eminent citizen of the United States said: "Bolshevism is knocking at our gates. We can't afford to let it in. We have got to organize ourselves against it and put our shoulders together and hold fast. We must keep American whole and safe and unspoilt. We must keep the workers away from Red literature. We must see that his mind remains healthy." Now who said that? It was Signor Al. Capone who said that. (Amusement). (Applause).

I submit to you that it is all too easy in the passion and the pressure of events—and that pressure is going to get greater and not less—to line up with that eminent American citizen upon that road, to feel that any rational, reasonable discussions on his greatest of all issues for or against the capitalistic system is impossible and to fall back on a policy of repression. I must admit that since my last visit to this Dominion you have been going in the other direction to some extent. When I was here last I found the official leaders of the Communist party in jail. I am glad to see that that is no longer the case (Applause), but the statute under which they were put in jail is still on the statute books and it does seem to me that Canada today is to some extent at the turning point. Are you going to keep that Statute—I think its Number is 98, is it not—upon the Statute Book? Are you going to fall back upon the policy of repression, trying to keep under all those forces which are generated, not I assure you by any words of agitators—I have been an agitator myself and I know how very little influence an agitator can have. What generates those forces is the economic situation itself, and it generates them whether they are repressed or not. Are you going to attempt to solve the problem that way? I think you are not going to find a solution to it along the line of repression. Or are you going to deal with it along the other direction, the line of reasoning discussion, looking the facts in the face, hearing all sides and study what is really the situation in the world today? It is a difficult enough task, it is a complex enough situation, and it needs the highest courage to face it, but it does seem to me that if the violence which racks the world today, both within and between nations, is even to be minimized, that is the only possibility, that we should not attempt to repress the opinions which we do not like but should face the real situation, open our minds to discussion and see what is the real line of solution.

Mr. Dana Porter, on behalf of the Empire Club, thanked the speaker.

INDIA AND THE EMPIRE

AN ADDRESS BY MR. A. I. RAJA-SINGHAM

Thursday, January 31, 1935

The guest speaker was introduced by the President of The Empire Club, Mr. Dana Porter.

MR. DANA PORTER: Gentlemen, not many months ago the Marquis of Lothian spoke to the members of this Club and in the course of his speech he predicted that at the next general election in Great Britain one of the chief issues would probably be the White Paper as to the government of India.

The importance of the situation in India is not only apparent to the people who vote in Great Britain itself but it is, obviously, of very great importance to the people of this country, and merely because India is a part of the British Empire it is also a subject of intense interest to us and a subject about which we are all anxious to learn more.

Mr. Rajah-Singham, our guest of honour today, tells me that except for this visit in which he is now engaged, he has never before left India. This is the first time he has ever left the shores of India. He was educated in India, although possibly by his command of English you may be unable to detect that, and his whole life has been spent in the southern part of that country.

He comes to us, and we always welcome a variety of points of view in this Club, he comes to us expressing a point of view which, perhaps, we have not quite had before. His point of view is at once British, it is Indian, and it is Christian. We have had speakers at this Club who have represented the purely British point of view and those who have represented the Indian point of view and perhaps we have had those who represented the combination of those two points of view, but in Mr. Rajah-Singham, we have a native Indian who is a Christian and who is a believer in the institutions of the British Empire and in the maintaining of India as a part of that Empire.

I have very great pleasure in calling on Mr. Rajah-Singham.

MR. A. I. RAJAH-SINGHAM: Mr. President and Members of the Empire Club: I thank you for this privilege you have given me of letting me be your guest today.

I want to speak as plainly and as briefly as I could on this important question of "India within the Empire." I have chosen the subject because of the fact that during the last twenty years, or rather after the cessation of the Great War, in the west, the word that has swept people off their feet has been 'self-determination'. In the East, the word that swept people off their feet, especially in my country, has been 'swaraj'. Self-determination and swaraj have swept people off their feet and I come to you, asking to open a new avenue of thought altogether and the new avenue of thought is this: That people could be self-determined, people could govern themselves, people could have a say in the government of their own affairs and yet remain as an important and contributing and co-operating partner of the great Commonwealth of Nations. (Applause).

The problem of India has been approached from different angles. My friend, Chandra Bose, Ex Lord Mayor of Calcutta, would like everybody to approach the problem of India in this way; he would say about India: "Had she not once been the High Priestess of the Orient? Had not her civilization left its ripple mark on the furthermost limits of Asia? India still had a soul to save which the parching drought of modern vulgarity threatened daily with death; she alone in a pharisaical world, where every one acclaimed God in speech and denied him in spirit, India alone offered him the worship of her heart; she alone gave birth to the choice spirits who cast aside the highest of earth's gifts in their enraptured pursuits of the life of life . . . Was India to deform herself from the Temple of God into one vast inglorious suburb of English civilization?"

Those words are not my words. Those are the words of Mr. Chandra Bose, Ex Lord Mayor of Calcutta. He represents a school of thought in India which would like to approach the Indian problem in that way.

Again, I would like you to approach the problem from the words of a much better man, a man I admire greatly —Rabindranath Tagore. His prayer for India is contained in these words:

"Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;
Where knowledge is free,
Where the world has not been broken up by narrow domestic walls,
Where words come out from the depth of truth
Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way in the dreary desert sand of dead habit
Where the mind is led forward by Thee into ever widening thought and action,
Into that Heaven of Freedom, my Father, let my country awake."

In between those two great points is the gulf wherein lies the vast majority of the people of India. There is Chandra Bose who would like to lead India through a revolution into freedom, whatever that freedom might mean in the end. There is Rabindranath Tagore who would like India to work to that ideal place where everybody is stated as a human being and nobody has special privileges.

I would like to stick to Rabindranath Tagore's idea, but I would like to alter the last words and say: Into that Heaven of Freedom, my Father, lead me to take my country.

I don't want my God to work miracles just because a group of human beings had become important, and ninety per cent of India's population lies in that gulf of impotency. Their problems have never been watched, their words have never been brought to the public's attention, they have never been given an opportunity to speak for themselves. Why? Because eighty-five per cent of the people of India are still illiterate. Just because of that their voice has never been heard. Where there is illiteracy, no politicians go. There is rumour, gossip, talk here and there. They are swept off their feet by every passing crowd, every passing show that comes along, and they march along and say, "Here we are, marching toward freedom." That will never bring us to the true freedom we are longing for.

A hundred years ago, Lord Macaulay made a statement. You had sent to India an English gentleman, a hundred years ago, Lord Macaulay who had made a mark by his military education, a prominent man, and he made this statement: "The destinies of our Indian Empire are covered with thick darkness. It is difficult to form any connection as to the fateful result for a state which resembles no other in history and which forms by itself a separate class of political phenomena. The laws which regulate its growth and decay are still unknown to us. It may be that the mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown that system; that by good government we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better government; that having become instructed in European knowledge they may in some future age demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not, but never will I attempt to avert or retard it. Whenever it comes it will be the proudest day in English history."

A hundred years have passed by. The laws which regulate India's growth and decay are still unknown to many people. A hundred years have gone by. Institutions have stood for their purpose; institutions, Indian and Western, have tried their level best to solve the problems of the people of the country and today, after a hundred years, it will be right to say, the laws which regulate its growth and decay are still unknown to the vast majority of people handling the problems of India.

India has had a type of education, based on the minutes of Lord Macaulay, and after a hundred years of that type of education, we find two and a half million of vociferous millions whose voice is heard. Unfortunately, I belong to that group. They are people who go about the whole world and would like India to be run exactly according to their wishes. Two and a half million people who would not consider how best it is possible to bring out the great majority of ninety per cent as a co-operating partner in the government of the affairs of the country. No country can become independent until the vast majority of the people are willing to co-operate in the government of its own affairs and India is not in that prepared state to be able to co-operate in that government, the large majority of them.

Why are the large majority of the people in India unable to co-operate? Because the two and a half million men that are educated in English were taught that if they imitated the Englishman, if they became the perfect Englishman, that the salvation of the problems of India would have been reached. They came to that stage twenty-five years ago. Two and a half million of the people were purely imitative Indian gentlemen. They had education, scientific and otherwise, everything that western institutions could give them, but they lacked the philosophy back of the Englishman, the philosophy that made his country, that still makes him hold himself through the greatest and most difficult trials of the world and steer clear and bring out something that is best for the human world. That philosophy was lacking in India. The philosophy of the Indian man was quite different. It was something like this: "The world in which I live is a mirage; why worry myself to do anything to improve this world? All these things are created by God and have got to be in the state in which they are created. I have nothing to do in the ordering of these things." Naturally, the people are like that. When they have attained that imitative education, after they are given the capacity to voice their own sentiments, to be able to see a foreign government in India is difficult.

Indian people are often expected when they come to western countries, if they want to make a good speech, to be able to put out a catalogue of grievances against the British. I do not want even you, even though you belong to the Empire, even though you are members whose heart is tied down to the Empire to a great extent, I do not want you to be under the hallucination that all English people are a group of angels dropped from Heaven. Neither do I want you to be under the illusion that every Indian man who has a grievance is speaking his grievance out because he is prejudiced against the Britisher. There have been causes for grievance in India and it stands out because some of them are outstanding causes. When people, for a hundred years, have imitated the people who have considered themselves superiors, the faults of the people they imitated and considered superior always stand out, they predominate, and those faults have been found in English people, administrators, here and there. Fortunately, I am in a position to say they are not numerous. Fortunately, I am in a position to say they have been not intentional. They have been errors of judgment and because of this, the English people still haven't found out what is the underlying problem in the heart of India. It is a difficult problem to find out because India is a country of bewildering diversity.

Somebody in the paper put me up as an authority on South India. It is all right for newsaper men to travel in India five days and become an authority on India, but it is not possible for any man who has lived in India thirty years to be able to stand up and say, "I am an authority on India."

India is a country of bewildering diversity, and no man can himself, be an authority even in one province. How do you expect a whole group of people, diversified in language, diversified in religion, diversified in social custom, in so many unimaginable little things, how do you exepect a foreign people to go into India and be able to imbibe and see through the culture of forty centuries and bring out what will be the finest and best for the good of India?

Let me say this about the British people; in spite of all the mistakes they have made, in spite of everything that might have happened there, I am proud to be a member of the British Empire. (Applause). I do not say that merely because I have to be a member of the British Empire. I say that because of this: If you analze the contacts between the West and the East especially in the East today, Great Britain will stand out as the nation, making due allowances—I want to rub that in as much as possible—making due allowancse for all the mistakes that have been made, England will stand out as one nation whose contact with the East is predominantly full of fair play and justice and I am glad to be able to say that. But that does not in any way exonerate England's great responsibility to that great country. A good statesman is not a person who is able to keep 360 millions of people under the British flag. A good statesman is not a person who is able to suppress extreme movements in the country. A good statesman is one who will direct the 360 millions of people, to the betterment of the whole human race. A good statesman is one who is able to direct extreme opinion and extreme channels of thought into constructive action. That is the greatest duty for Great Britain, and to find out the plan of being able to do that will be the greatest duty that Great Britain has to face.

How is this going to be faced? Indian people are not willing to look at the major problems of India. The major problem is in the villages of India. What are the villages of India? I can speak with authority at least about a little bit of the part of South India in which I live. They are unimaginable to the Western villager. The Western villager cannot easily think what a village in India is. Apart from the larger cities, I don't think there is any comparison I can take back to the towns. The small cities are something like the big towns of India. To compare the villages would be difficult. They consist of little mud huts, thatched roofs, one room, in which live families of four or five, cattle, and all poor people must have a dog—I don't know why they always must have and feed a dog. I don't know why. And all these things are cluttered together in one place.

Now, speak to them about politics. What right have they to think about politics? Speak to them about important social movements. What right have they to think about it. Their greatest problem is to eke out a living in their own country. Their greatest problem, after working hard, is to subsist on the meagre earnings they can get. They are unable to do it. Why are they unable to do it? Because their methods of agriculture, their modes of living, their hygenic conditions are all tied up in the villages, not with what is called religion, because religion in the vast majority of the villages could be called superstition. I would not like you to believe—I see a lot of clerical gentlemen here—I don't want you to believe the whole of India is a heathen country. I have changed my explanation of the word 'heathen' since I have come over to the Western countries I no longer think of heathenism as having any geography in any part of the world. Heathenism is rampant everywhere and I no longer want you to think of India as a whole block of heathen people. But there is a superstition, just as bad or worse than having a heathen religion. There is a superstition that does not allow them to take one step in their life, birth or marriage, or cultivation or government, all affaris, everything has got to be in connection with religion and tied up in that thing is the problem of India.

Introduce any method of agriculture; they at once want to find out how it is going to work as far as the religion is concerned. Introduce new hygienic methods; they have to ask the question, "Is it all right? Will the priest O.K. this business?" Introduce anything, everything has got to be touched by religion. Sometimes it is a good thing when life is touched by religion, provided religion is not superstition. I am a great believer in the fact that the whole of life is sacred. I am not a believer in the fact that life can be divided into compartments—a Sunday department, and a week day department; business, secular; and Sunday, religious. I am not a believer in that. I am a believer in the fact that every plan of life should be touched by religion. I am a believer in the fact that God should be introduced into every path of life and men should consider themselves right in the hands of God, whether doing business or preaching in the pulpit.

But in India, unfortunately, this sacredness of life has been thwarted and instead of a conception of God working through the different branches of life, what has come into India is a superstition, a fear—"I won't lift this"; "I won't do that"; and "I won't do the other thing"—just because something is going to happen to irritate my god or goddess and I am going to be punished.

That has got to be removed. What is going to remove it? No foreign power, no outside force can remove it. The reform, that movement has to come from the roots of India and the reform will come when its two and a half million of educated young men and women who are thinking in terms of government jobs, when they recognize by themselves that they are forgetting the problems of their own people down below, when they begin to recognize that the education they have received, that the education that has become possible to them has got to be put into instructive channels in the villages of India; when Indian young men and women begin to see that they have to go back to the villages and bring into action the thing brought to them by foreign people from outside, when they can adopt the educational systems, when they can adopt knowledge, when they can adopt the teachings of science to improve village conditions and when it comes naturally in the only Indian way, the thing will work. That is the greatest problem before the people of India.

We have wasted now, twenty years in propaganda. The last twenty years in the history of India will go out as a most important period. When you touch the last twenty years of Indian history, you come to the period when the great Mahatma Ghandi launched into India. Mahatma Ghandi came fortified by the power of reputation in South Africa; he came fortified by his successes in South Africa; he came fortified by the good opinions of some of the outstanding English people in the Old Country. Naturally, when he came to India twenty years ago, when everybody was expecting some great movement in India, Mahatma Ghandi mistook his call. I make this statement with all due reverence to Mahatma Ghandi, for I am a firm believer in the fact that India has not produced a greater man than Mahatma Ghandi during the last fifty years. I want to give due credit, because of the fact that one man goes into public life and tried his level best not to draw something out of public life; that is to say, not to gain something for himself, not to pay himself, get a position in life, and he also tried the most impossible thing in politics—he tried to combine politics and honesty. Mahatma Ghandi has tried to do it, but Mahatma Ghandi has not been successful. It is an almost impossible thing to combine honesty and politics and that is one of the difficulties Mahatma Ghandi has reached.

Giving Mahatma Ghandi all due credit for what he has done, I would like to say that twenty years ago he mistook his call in India. Instead of going as the leader of the high caste people, instead of trying to turn the channels of high caste people's thinking and opinion into political ideas, if he had started out as the redeemer of the untouchable people in India, India would have been a different country today. If he had done twenty years ago what he is trying after failing in five different schemes and having lost the respect of the people in India, itself; for, being a practical man, if he had not done that but had gone right into the problem of the Indian people in the villages of India and started the reconstruction and the commandeering of all the young men and women who are educated into service in the villages for the untouchable people for the education of the people, to bring about better sanitary conditions and better ways of living, then India would be in a better condition today. And I want to say this: if Ghandi had done that for twenty years, if the high caste people of India had given Great Britain the proof that they were willing to work for the untouchable man, that they were willing to work for the underdog, that this was not a passing, flittering thing, this question of political freedom, that this was not an empty cry but permanent business, I say this, I have sufficient faith in Great Britain to say that Great Britain would be the first person to stand up and say that India is able to do something for herself and would be willing to walk out and leave her more power. I believe in it but that thing has not been done.

There is no use crying over spilled milk. We have got to get to action. One of the greatest difficulties between the West and the East is this: the lack of understanding between the West and the East. We, in the East, move in a slow way. You, in the West, can create a new nation and forget it in twenty years. We, in the East, slumber and sleep and by the time we turn over in our sleep, it has been twenty years for us. That is our problem. Any movement in India would be slow and the Western people have got to be careful not to expect us to rush, for after all, I find that those who rush so are in the same mess as we are. In our country we have to do things in a real constructive way and we want that to be done in India.

What is the best way of creating understanding between the West and the East? I say this, I want the Anglo-Saxon race, and especially every Britisher, to recognize that you came into India and started a schooling for the people of India. They were good students under you. Foreign people must now recognize the fact that the students now want to be school masters among their own people. Don't hold up your hands in holy horror when you see Indian people wanting to take up the problems of their own country and wanting to do certain things, but be patient with them and encourage them to go on in that for therein lies the solution of the problems of the Indian people, in using Indian people to solve Indian problems and I am also thankful at this stage to be able to say that Great Britain has done quite a lot in creating Indian leadership in that country.

The real problem. Mahatma Ghandi looked at the problem of village reconstruction. The real problem is this: Ninety per cent of the people have no sympathy with the political movement in India. When the new movement is set on foot, when the new Constitution comes into force, at best, six and a half per cent of the adult population of India will be having a vote. Six and a half per cent of the adult population in India will be having a vote under the new Constitution when it comes. You see how difficult it is to work such a problem.

One of the things I would like to urge also on the Anglo-Saxon people would be this, that the Anglo-Saxon people recognize that India is a peculiar unit in the whole of the Asiatic countries. India has nothing in common with the rest of the Asiatic nations. Somehow she is unable to fit in with the Asiatic philosophy and India has more in common with the people of the British race than they have in common with the Chinese or the Japanese people. That does not mean that we have no sympathy for the aspirations of the Chinese or the Japanese people. Unfortunately, we find we are unable to go whole heartedly into the philosophy of China and of Japan. Fortunately, there is one way out. The one way out is this:

to utilize, without destroying our culture, the things that will revive our culture and in that way we can find co-operation between the Western culture and the Eastern culture. I don't want to run down Western culture; I don't want Westerners to run down Eastern culture. If any Easterner runs down Western culture, I have no respect for the Eastern culture he represents; if any Westerner runs down Eastern culture, I have no respect for the Western culture he represents. (Applause.) If any man has got to make his culture stand shoulder high above another man's culture, by running the other man's culture down, there is something fundamentally wrong with that culture. The only thing to do is to bring the best out of India for India's use and make here a co-operative partner in the Empire.

I am a Christian. And I make no apology for being a Christian. (Applause.) I say that because I have met very few people who are willing to talk politics in the terms of the Lord Jesus Christ. I have met very few people who are willing to put into action the principles of Christ in every day life. I have met very few people who think it is practicable to try to bring Christ down to every day problems today, and as I stand here, I can think of only one instance in the whole of India which would justify my bringing this question up before a Club like this.

Out of all the chaos and misunderstanding that has taken place in India, there rose up in the midst of India an English gentleman, during the last seven years, who has turned the tide of Indian affairs to a great extent. This gentleman was present at the Round Table Conference in England, and there was present at the Round Table Conference in England all shades of opinion—Mahomedan, Hindu, Bengalian, all kinds, diversified as they were—amid the clash of opinions, the lack of unanimity as to the future of India, there were people willing to pay the highest tribute to this one man. Man after man got up and said this: Thank God for one man.

Our great Mahomedan leader who had said that he wouldn't go back to India as a land of bondage, who wanted freedom for India before he left the shores of England. And he stood up and said, "If George the Third lost America for England, George the Fifth would have lost India for England had it not been for one man. Thank God for that tall, thin Englishman, Lord Irwin, who came into the situation at the most critical moment."

Lord Irwin did more for India than any number of Indian people or any number of English statesmen put together. What did he do? He approached the problems of India in a human way. He did not play the problems as a game of chess. He did not say, "This I can sacrifice, and that I can sacrifice, as long as I can save the King and the Bishop and the dignitaries there." He said that every man has a personilty to be respected and the Indian people have a personality to be respected and I am willing to go out every length to try and solve India's problems in a human way, recognizing him as a Christian man. Lord Irwin was willing to put Christian prestige before British prestige.

A very modern thing to do. The day we begin to put our national prestige in the background and try and put the prestige that is most important, that is the prestige of recognizing that the last and least of the human race bears the image and superscription of Him whom some of us so reluctantly call our Creator, the moment we recognize that then our problems will become simple. Lord Irwin did that, I am thankful to say that many other British statesmen are willing to do that and therein is found the salvation of the problems of India.

Yesterday I read that one of the missionary ladies said this: The reason why they were not molested in India as they were in China was because of the fact of British rule in India. May I correct that statement? The Indian man never wants to molest any man who comes in the name of God. Irrespective of colour, race or what their personal qualifications may be, the Indian man will always sit and listen to a person who comes in the name of God. With all due respect to the lady, I would like to say that the Indian people do not molest people who come to them because they recognize that they come in the name of God—not because of British military power or anything else, but because they recognize them as people who come in the name of the Prince of Peace.

And I say, repeatedly, the problems of India can only be solved and I do trust, as I know in the press of this country there seems to be a great deal of lack of courage, as is evidenced when a man comes 15,000 miles from India and speaks about Christ in this country and they at once make it a point to drop off the things he said about Christ as if there were a law made in this country that the name of Christ should not appear in the press, and I do trust what I say will appear if anything appears in the press, and I say, the solution of the problems of the whole world is, in my mind, the recognition of the fact that no human being in the world is a pawn. Every human being has a personality and we cannot play in the game of chess any longer. The sooner you and I—business men, people in religious work all over the world—begin to recognize that human beings have a personality and that every personality has got to be respected and that we should do the very best to our neighbour as we expect our neighbour to do to us. Then our problems are solved and Christ has brought the salvation of the prestige of this country and that country and I am a firm believer in that fact.

Many people have asked the reason why I am here. Many people thought I came over to entertain people or give them political ideas. I have come over to this country that the Western World might rise to the opportunity that the Eastern World gives for moral leadership. You have called yourselves Christians and the Eastern World wants you to be Christian. If you are Christian first, British second, and Canadian third—or you may put it in any other order you like, you will become the leaders of the people in India. I want that to be done. I am come to this country, representing probably one of the worst groups in India, a group of people, especially in the Island of Ceylon, who have been thrust into this world without a nationality, without a name, without a loyalty, a group of people come into the world because my people did not have the conception of the respect that is due to personality, because a few of your representatives—fortunately, not all—a few of your British who came to my country did not have the respect for personality and as a result of that in the Island of Ceylon there is the problem known as the Eurasian problem—half white, half Indian, a man of no country, the speckled bird of society—and I want Christian people to recognize that if you want leadership, moral, in the Eastern World, those patches, those sores, those scars on the side of India must be blotted out. There are Indian people who are willing to stand back of you to blot out those scars. An Empire built by the blotting out of those scars we have created will last much longer than an Empire built by military force and the constructive part of the whole thing is this: There are Indian people today seeing through the eyes of Christ, thinking through the mind of Christ. There are Indian people willing to co-operate with you.

You listen to speakers; you would think that an Empire was built by calling each of you by your first name, by patting each other on the back in service clubs. I want a group of Western people who are active men, not fact finders. You have all the knowledge before you. What you lack is this: You don't want to take action.

Christ says, if a man wants to be a master of the world, he has to be a servant of the world. An empire built on service will stand much longer than an empire built on aggression. I do not for a moment use the word 'aggression' with any connection to the British people.

I want to sum up by saying this: The finest and best that has come to us has come to us from the British people and I would be the sorriest, saddest man on the face of this world, in the British Empire, to see England sever connection with India. I would also be the sorriest, saddest man on the face of this world and in the British Empire, if Christian people who know the truth fall down on their job in moral leadership in the world, and today is the day for moral leadership in the world.

I appeal to you business men, and I appeal to you men in this country, to recognize that the problem of India is just a human problem, not a problem of a brown race to be solved by the white western race, but the problem of a human race, that can be solved by human beings if they possess the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ.

(Prolonged applause.)

THE MELANCHOLY OF LAUGHTER

AN ADDRESS BY MR. H. NAPIER MOORE

Thursday, February 7, 1935

MR. DANA PORTER: It was a Chancellor of the Exchequer of the British Government in the nineteenth century, one who doubtlessly carried out his duties competently and efficiently, but who has now fallen into obscurity, who said that life would be tolerable if it were not for its amusements.

That, perhaps, would be strange coming from a Chancellor of the Exchequer, but it is the sort of thing you might expect to hear from our guest of honour today, Mr. Napier Moore, because Mr. Napier Moore, as far as we can gather, edits the writings of various people who think they are supplying amusement and in the course of that experience, Mr. Moore has developed a sort of mellow cynicism toward these things. We heard him, not very long ago, address us on the subject: Does Life Exist After Marriage? It is only a magazine editor, who reads love stories from morning until night who would ever have thought of a subject of that kind for an address before The Empire Club, and I also suggest that it is only an editor of a magazine, and as far as we know, it is only Mr. Napier Moore who has thought of the subject, "The Melancholy of Laughter," because in his position he has found, possibly, that there is a certain melancholy in many of the attempts that he has been forced to read, to make people laugh. I have great pleasure in calling upon Mr. Moore. (Applause).

MR. NAPIER MOORE: Mr. President and Gentlemen of The Empire Club: I have been trying very hard to avoid feeling like a certain Mr. Higgins, the junior officer on board a British tramp which was steadily progressing on its course in the South Seas. One very fine morning the Captain of the craft came to Mr. Higgins and said, "Mr. Higgins, I want you to take the ship's position this noon. I want you to get out your instruments and record the sun, after which, let me have your findings and I will check up on the ship's chart."

Mr. Higgins said, "Well, Sir, I feel rather nervous about doing that. I have never done it before. The Captain said, "Well, there is no time like the present for starting—you do it."

So, somewhat nervously, Mr. Higgins got out his sextant and took the position of the ship as he found it, put it down on a piece of paper and sent it in to the skipper. A few moments later the Captain came out of the charter house, looking very grave and said, "Mr. Higgins, we shall take our hats off; we are in Westminster Abbey."

I feel today, as though I were standing in Westminster Abbey. (Laughter).

The last time I spoke here I had five or seven minutes notice and I came galloping down, full of zest and vigour, not knowing exactly what was going to happen, but on this occasion, I have had one week's notice and I felt at the beginning that with one week's notice, a speaker should attempt to put over the idea that he is a great constructive force. Now, it is very tiring being a great constructive force, particularly immediately after luncheon, and so I thought that with your permission, I might begin at any rate, by dealing with a lighter subject—take laughter, for instance—and then go back to the established practice of becoming drearier and drearier as time goes on.

There are a great many melancholy aspects toward laughter. May I point out to you, or remind you of the fact that in every day language, when we speak of laughing we relate it to an attribute of the lower animals. For instance, you never refer to anyone laughing unless you say that they bellowed or they roared, or they cackled, or they laugh like a hyena, or they have a horse laugh, or they grin like a Cheshire cat or like an ape. You see at once, there is hardly anything in the way of a reference to laughter that isn't somewhat depressing.

A very distinguished Englishman by the name of Lord Chesterfield, who is supposed to be the standard of manners, said that no gentlemen could afford to laugh, first of all, because of the ugly noise and secondly, because of the amazing distortion of the human face. In fact, he said, "It is only low buffoonery or silly actors that always provoke laughter and that is what people of sense and breeding show themselves above."

So now you see yourselves in your colours.

The Orientals, for instance, very rarely laugh. Chinese think laughter is only fit for women and fitter for children and not at all fit for a beard.

It is a curious thing that, to my knowledge at any rate, there never has been in the history of literature, a novelist who has gained immortality by provoking laughter alone. There never has been a great book that has continued to live through the centuries because its main object was to make people laugh. Today, with the exception, perhaps, of P. G. Wodehouse, there isn't an author of note, the author of a single best seller that I can recall, a seller that will last for years, that is based on laughter.

So, we come to an analysis of what it is that makes people laugh. We laugh principally because of things that defy laws. Every time we cackle or giggle it is because of lawlessness within us, the upsetting of natural laws, for instance, the law of gravity. We never laugh at a cock crowing but we go into hysterics when we hear a man imitate a cock crowing. It is a reversal of the natural plan.

I find nothing to laugh at in walking down University

Avenue and seeing a man with a hat on his head, but I laugh if the wind blows the hat off. Similarly, such exaggerations as large red noses, that many so-called comedians effect, create laughter because they are unnatural.

In other words, the pattern of life has been broken and we become seized with mirth at the very idea. As I say, it is born of a certain element of lawlessness that dwells within every one of us. Now, the fact that you should laugh at the outset at the unhappy position of Mr. Higgins, gives you a clue to the second reason for laughter; that is that practically no joke is on any other basis than that of somebody's discomfort. There is hardly an anecdote you can think of that isn't based on what is a tragedy to some one else.

Now, there is a classic proof of that in the story of the South African farmer who came back to his farm after a somewhat lengthy absence and was met on the railway station platform by his carrier boy. He said to the boy, "What is the matter, Joe? You look down in the mouth. Bad news?"

The boy said, "Yes, Boss. The baboon is dead.

"O, what did he die of?" asked the master. "Too much horse flesh, Boss."

The master said, "Where did he get the horse flesh?" The boy said, "He got it the night the two horses died."

"Horses died. When did they die?" demanded the master. "In the fire, Boss", said the boy.

"What fire?" "Your house, Boss", replied the lad.

"What night was that?" "The night of the funeral, Boss", was the answer.

"Whose funeral?" asked the master. "Your mother's funeral, Boss. She died of a broken heart after your father committed suicide," said the boy.

And the Boss said, "Is Father dead, too?" The boy said, "Yes, the shock of losing the farm and all the business killed him.

The farmer said, "Good Heavens!" And the boy said, "That is not all, Boss. The baboon is dead, too."

You see, it is a story, every line of which is simply steeped in melancholy and yet it provides amusement.

About the only exceptions to that rule are Scotch stories and the reason for the exception is that the Scot is very rarely discomfited. It is his amazing self assurance and complacency that gives the greatest laughter to other people. For instance, I can demonstrate that by the story of the head of the clan, MacGregor, who was giving a lecture on family tradition to his family and he said, "This history of the MacGregors is contained in five large volumes and in the middle of the second part of the third volume there is a wee marginal note which says, "It was about this time that the world began." (Laughter).

Now, it is very difficult to write funny stuff because of the fact that most of the laugh provoking devices that are used in books or in articles or anecdotes are very, very old. They seldom change and it becomes increasingly difficult to get a laugh out of what have been referred to as the seven original jokes. My estimate is that there were only three original jokes.

So the novelist of repute, the one who gains lasting fame, takes something different. He takes a solemn subject because it is much easier for him to keep pace with the time. Any novel that is interesting, generally speaking, has as its theme some phase of contemporary life and the necessary conditions as to plot and characterization by changes in the social and economic phenomena of the life it represents, and plots as well as characters change. Things that were possible centuries ago are no longer possible. It is very difficult, for instance, to answer people who say, "Why don't you give us fiction like we used to read in the days of Queen Victoria?" It is largely because, with the stories presented today, the vast majority of people won't read them. If they did, they would not find them convincing.

For instance, in the old days, if it was necessary to remove a character from a story there was always the duel and the author by having the duel turn out one way or another could remove a character that was beginning to clutter up the landscape. Today, the only way it can be done is by having a change of government. (Laughter).

Now, two or three centuries ago, and even more recently than that, the likeable people in fiction were the aristocrats. They were the lords and dukes and the squires and so forth. And the comic relief was provided by merchants, business men and people of that kind. They were the butts of smart society. Then came the industrial revolution in England and the merchant and the trader and the shopkeeper were elevated in the social scale and so it has progressed, as we have recognized our life, until today we find most of the heroes, most of the central characters in all our stories are business men and shop keepers and merchants and that the height of comedy relief is provided by the same people who years ago were the heroes; in other words, the aristocrats and so forth. All the jokes are levelled at the lily in the field today.

It is the same with violence. You no longer have your Uriah Heap type of violence, or the type of violence invented by Dickens. Not so. As a result of our profound studies of John and Fred we now discover the violence is a violence caused by some peculiar childhood complex he inherited because of some mental defect in his great, great grandfather or great, great grandmother. So it is impossible to write a story in which you have an out and out Uriah Heap type of violence.

It is the same with plots. The plot of the story is necessarily affected by modern science. It is no longer possible to create suspense because of a cargo of bullion bound from the Colonies to England with the suspense depending on whether or not that cargo is going to get there, whether pirates are going to intercept it, whether mutiny will result in the treasure being stolen and the ship scuttled; it is very, very rare that a thing of that kind happens now. You can even mail a letter with some assurance that it will be delivered within two weeks on the other side of the Atlantic and if delivery were beyond the fortnight it would be some matter of talk. We can no longer rely upon this means to establish suspense in a plot.

The same is true with style. The rather ponderous and pompous style of the Victorian age no longer has any attraction at this time, of simplification. Right here, I want to go on record with an assertion that from an editorial point of view and a personal point of view, I think simplification has been carried too far. I hold in my hand the college yell of the Christian College of California, and it goes like this:

Oompah, oompah, oompah, oompah
Oompah, oompah, oompah, oompah.
Killie, killie, killie, killie
Wash. Wash. Wash. Wash.
Hy-ho, hi-yo, ki-yah.

That is the College yell of the California Christian College!

I have another one. Now, this is the Yale imbecility. It goes like this:

Well, aboolaboo, well aboolaboo
Well, aboola, boola boolaboo
Boola, boola, boola, boola
Boola, boola, boola, boola.

(Laughter).

There is a great deal of melancholy in that laughter because our own Canadian universities and our Canadian colleges, taking leaf out of the book of these institutes of profound learning on the other side of the line, have yells even more lunatic than those I have just read out.

It is a sad commentary on our educational system when we spend thousands of dollars a year and make all kinds of sacrifices as parents to have our friends come home and recite lines such as those I have just delivered.

Away back in 1912, when I lived in Victoria, B.C., I bought two lots. One of them was situated in Kelowna, on Okanagan Lake. The other, according to the prospectus, was situated in the City of Calgary. I hadn't seen the property. I went down the Okanagan Valley three years later to see my Kelowna lot and discovered that the C.P.R. steamships were running over it regularly, and when I went to see my Calgary lot I finally found it up in Red Deer, where it really was located. (Laughter).

Now, there is a great deal of melancholy behind that laughter, not only because of my personal misfortune—as a matter of fact, I discovered in the case of the Kelowna lot that I wasn't so badly off; while I paid for it, the man who paid for it hadn't got the title to it; in fact the man who sold it to him had not got the title to it; it had passed through three or four hands without anyone having the right to dispose of it—I say there is melancholy in that laughter because it indicates the spirit of the time. It indicates that in that spirit lies the explanation for a great many of the disasters that have befallen us as a nation in the past few years. I have made the assertion repeatedly, amidst tremendous laughter, that we haven't had a depression at all in this country, that really we have been getting over a very bad boom.

Now, the boom created a great deal of melancholy laughter in the days of Dickens. Perhaps you read his "American Notes," and of his Eden City, and so forth, and my laughter is tempered by a little sadness because we did exactly the same thing in this country, away back in 1912, and then more recently.

I look in the dictionary for the derivation and meaning of both the words, "depression" and "boom," and I find that a depression means, among other things, a humbling, and an abasement; and that boom means, among other things, sound, as in an empty barrel.

We have been carried away in the past by the romantic aspect of development to the exclusion of the practical. We have overlooked the fact that the greatness of a country does not depend upon the number of square miles in it but that it depends upon the number of square people in it. (applause). I do not need to recall to any man present some of the amazing things that have been done in this country in the name of mining, in the name of real estate. Nothing less than fraud. People deprived of their hard earned cash by swindlers—propositions that never should have seen the light of day have been allowed to flourish and only now, at long last, are we taking measures that are going to correct that situation.

There is melancholy laughter in the fact that we have departed so far from the aims and the objects of the Fathers of Confederation that, instead of creating one nation, we have built up nine independent, jealous states.

Believe me, Gentlemen, if you had to edit a national magazine and try to cater to the people of each section, you would realize how far we are from being one unified nation. We have provided, as a result of our exuberance and optimism for a population little larger than that of greater London, not as large as the combined populations of New York and Philadelphia, we have given them ten governments, ten kings, ten Prime Ministers, nine Ministers of Agriculture, ten Civil Services, ten Judiciaries, and in addition to that, we have got 4,181 municipal governments, all of which have the power to impose taxes and pass laws. We have got more people working for governments than work in all the 6,000 families of our twenty-two leading manufacturing industries.

The Canadian wage earner, on an average, directly and indirectly, gives one week's pay out of every four to support one government or another. And we have gone along, with the utmost ignorance and the utmost apathy.

I can't escape the parallel of the man who had always earned so small an income that he never paid any income tax and finally he got an increase in salary. This is fiction. (Laughter). Not knowing anything about the income tax, he didn't pay it, and one day in due season, there arrived the Federal Income Tax Inspector, who unto him did say: "Why have you not paid your income tax?" The man said, "Income tax? What is that?" So, very patiently, the Inspector explained: "Well, you see, if you are earning $2,000. a year, approximately, you give the Government $250."

The man said, "If I don't earn that, does the government give me $250?", and the Inspector said, "O, no, not at all." "O, well," said the man, "I don't think I will join." (Laughter).

Now, I don't for one moment want you to think I have overlooked some of the very fine things we have got. I think we are too prone to overlook things that are very close to us. I get fascinated every time I pass the Welland Canal. It doesn't thrill me much to be told that the Welland Canal is the largest series of locks in the world, but if somebody was to say to me, "I want you to come down town because they are going to raise a 15,000 ton ship to within fifty feet of the top of the Royal York and they are going to do it in less than an hour and six men are going to do it with no more effort than turning an electric light switch on and off six times", I would be fascinated and that is what we are doing every day, during our week of summer, in the Canal.

It is a stupendous feat. We conquered nature; the very lifting of that 362 feet is done with the power generated from the obstacle we set out to conquer, that of the Niagara Falls. We have done great things in conquering nature, but we have gone a little too far in that. We have conquered nature with such purpose that we are now moving thousands of families out of areas which can never grow wheat. We conquered nature by hacking down the forests in our water sheds with such great gusto that we can no longer hold water in the water shed and down go the lake levels which in some cases prevent our ships from carrying cargoes from Central Canada to the sea.

We have done a great many things in conquering nature and I see by the paper we are going to do a lot more. Well, it is very difficult to conquer nature.

There is another thing we used to laugh at. Remember how we used to laugh at England—funny old lady, stumbling along and muddling through. We thought that was very funny. It isn't so funny now. There is some melancholy in that laughter because of all countries, England seems to be farther along the road to recovery.

Herbert N. Casson, a Canadian who came from a small town in Ontario, who has spent twenty years of his life, here, twenty years in the United States and twenty years in England, wrote the other day: "There has been for nearly half a century a belief in Canada that the United States is the land of progress, and that Great Britain is the land of tradition. The United States is generally supposed to be up-to-date, while Britain is old-fashioned.

"The people in the old homeland are regarded as slow and somewhat behind the times. If a young Canadian businessman wanted to learn the new ideas and methods in business, it is quite probable that he would go to New York, not to London.

"The belief is only partly true. If a man wants to know only what is new, certainly he should go to New York, but if he wants to know what is sound and profitable he should go to London. If he wants to study successes, not experiments, he should go to Britain and study its five-generation companies." (Applause).

I have got an idea, maybe somewhat far fetched, but I do think there is a grain of truth in it, that most of the economic ills from which we have been suffering, most of the abuses of business come from our departure, in one measure or another, from the British principles—fair play and justice. I think, if you reason that out, you will find there is some measure of truth in it. I am not saying that Britain has reached the millennium—far from it. I am not saying she hasn't had failures and setbacks, that she hasn't had crooks, that she hasn't had sweat-shops. I do say this: in remedying those things she is about a hundred years ahead of us on this side of the Atlantic.

Doesn't it seem to you to be a preposterous state of affairs that in a country, four thousand miles wide, in a new country not a hundred years old as a confederated state, we should have in prairie towns and country districts, houses packed together on twenty-five foot lots, with the prairies stretching like an ocean on all sides? Doesn't it seem to be ridiculous that in cities that can only boast of a hundred years of existence, new cities in a new country, we should have such squalour and such appalling conditions of living as exist not only in Toronto but in the other large cities of this Dominion?

I think we could take quite a few clues from the Old Country. I see by the paper again this morning, that the Prime Minister bemoans the fact that we haven't enough trained minds in the country to take over large jobs. That is a rather sad reflection upon our educational system. I think we might be well advised to take another leaf out of the British book. In our parliaments—if we could ever get *one* parliament it would be so much better than as things are—where we have Cabinet Ministers placed in positions of responsibility and trust to look after our business interests, we force them, because of our system, to spend the best hours of their working day, sitting in the House in order to be ready to answer some stupid question. In England, you have a system of parliamentary secretaries, trained to the job, whose business it is to take on the answering of questions on minor subjects in the House, to leave the Minister free time in which to administer his Department and look after the interests of the country as a whole. I think we might try that without any trouble in this country but it seems there are some little party hitches in the way.

One thing more and I am through. I was looking at the Year Book of the Empire Club and I see, inscribed on the front page of the Constitution, "The object of this Club is the advancement of the interests of Canada and of a United Empire." And I was thinking coming down, that that is a very worthy object and I asked myself, "How far is that object being practiced? Can it achieve the advancement of Canada and the unity of the British Empire? Can it be achieved by just meeting once a week and sitting down and listening to a man speak?"

Out of that, there grew this thought: If you agree with me up to now, perhaps something can be gained by following the tradition laid down in the Mother Country. What better institution than The Empire Club could there be to further those objects throughout this country? Would it not be worth considering at all events, to signalize the Jubilee of King George this coming May, by this Club in some way setting forth to advance the ideals presented in its Constitution? How to do it, I don't know. I think we could leave that to the Executive, for what are executives for, if not to deal with things like that?

At a quarter to twelve today, I opened a manuscript, the concluding chapter of a book of reminiscences written by another journalist who stood at this table and behind this microphone not so very long ago—Beverley Baxter. I am an Englishman, I suppose turned completely Canadian. Beverley Baxter, born a Canadian has, I might say, turned completely English. The concluding words of his book seem to me to be most fitting for the concluding words of this oration. He said: I have seen this England which has become my home, enduring the arrows of war in her breast without cry or boast, and I have seen her outraged by the selfishness and the sensuality of the post-war years, and I have seen her rise in her simplicity and dignity to be finer in spirit than ever before in her past. (Prolonged applause).

Mr. Dana Porter:—It is a practice that is frequently followed when a minority shareholder of a company becomes objectionable and critical of the management, to elect him to the Board of Directors. In this case, however, Mr. Napier Moore has been a member of the Executive of this Club up until last year. I think at one time he was a Vice-President of the Club and he only retired because the pressure of the orations which he was called upon to give didn't leave him enough time to devote to the affairs of The Empire Club. Today, Mr. Moore has revealed himself in a role which I always thought he despised. He has revealed himself as an economist. I have heard him joke about economists, but today he has shown that he can hold his own among the best of them.

But there is one thing he has not yet explained in his business of laughter, and perhaps on some future occasion he will accept another invitation to come to this Westminster Abbey and explain to us why people read the comic strips.

I wish, on behalf of the Club, to thank you, Mr. Moore for your most—I won't say, melancholy address—I will say melancholy and entertaining address. Thank you very much.

THE THEATRE

AN ADDRESS BY DAME SYBIL THORNDIKE, C.B.E.

Thursday, February 21, 1935

Dame Sybil Thorndike was introduced by Mr. Dana Porter, President of The Empire Club.

MR. DANA PORTER: At one time it was the fashion to make gold watches thick and always to make sure that the works would be heard. Now, it is the fashion to make them so thin and silent that they create the illusion that there are no works whatever to make the watch go.

At one time on the stage it was the fashion to go in for glorious rant and when an actor or an actress died, it would really be necessary to do it in such a way that you would see and hear the various stages by which the process of decay set in.

Now, however, in the person of our guest of honour today, we have, perhaps, the greatest living example of the very best of the modern tendencies in the art of the stage and we have a technique which is so perfect that it conceals the machinery by which it conveys the illusions which are eventually put across.

Indeed, unless you have an opportunity of seeing Dame Sybil Thorndike in more than one play you may miss the perfection which is created, but if you see her in, for instance, a Greek tragedy, such as the "Medea," which is rather a sustained portrayal of woe, as I remember it, and then you see her as Queen Catherine in "Henry, the Eighth," followed, perhaps, by some lighter piece in which she plays the part of a bally dancer or a film star, you will then realize that although it seems to be a different person who is taking the role in these various plays, nevertheless she does it so effectively that without seeing the technique, the illusion is perfectly created in each case.

So, we have her in Toronto in a play which is different in type from all those I have mentioned—"The Distaff Side," and in that play, again, she is so perfect that perhaps we hardly realize the magnificence of the acting which she is presenting to us.

It is with very great pleasure that I introduce Dame Sybil Thorndike.

Dame Sybil Thorndike: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is with the greatest pleasure, though with somewhat of a pain inside my middle that I appear here today. It is a great joy to be able to meet the men and women of Canada, of Toronto, who are doing things in this land. I have had, of late years, a great pleasure and joy in travelling around the world, visiting the various nations which belong to our Empire and I have had a year and a half in Australia and New Zealand, a year in South Africa and in our smaller sort of mandated territories I have been; and Canada which was the first of our Dominions that I visited has not been seen by me for such a long time, so you may imagine how excited and pleased I have been to come here and take up old threads and meet with some of the good friends I knew before and friends from the other side. It is a very great joy and pleasure and somehow or other, links one with those other nations where I have been in these last few years, and we need some linking these days.

I have not come here to talk about that sort of linking. I have come here today because I want to say one or two words about the theatre. The theatre wants a few things said about it at the moment. The theatre in my knowledge and in my short, comparative, life on the stage of thirty-one years—that is not my own age; that is the time I have been on the stage; I shan't give the rest away—(laughter) the theatre during my time has always been said to be in a dying condition and, well, always being prepared for the funeral.

Now, the interesting thing to me is this: that since the coming of another great rival, since the coming of the cinema, we have been told that the theatre was finished entirely and that in a few years it would see our end.

Now, the cinema, first of all, before I say some other things about it, I want to talk about the theatre and the cinema together today. The cinema has had this wonderful effect on our nation and on the world: it has brought into a place of entertainment a great number of people that would never have been brought together in that sort of way at all. People say the cinema has taken away the people from the theatre and they now go somewhere else. I do not think that is wholly true. I think the cinema has touched a lot of people, probably never touched by the theatre at all, certainly in this generation; for money or various other reasons, they have not bothered with the theatre, but the cinema has given entertainment and has given people a sort of knowledge of what it is to join together in an entertainment.

The great need of human beings is some sort of personal expression, some sort of expression which is in communion with his fellow men, and it is a joy to be able to go to some place where a thing is being performed and there go through certain curves of emotion, certain intellectual things, certain feelings in common with our fellow men. It gives you a great feeling of understanding for the people you are suffering or laughing with. It gives you a knowledge of human beings that you can only get in a mob. There are certain parts of us which only open, which only respond when we sink our own personality in a larger personality.

It used to be so in the churches. They say people don't go to church now. Of course, that is not true in England because the churches are fuller than they have ever been in their life, I think. Churches did provide that to a large extent—provided some means of feeling with you fellow men. Well the theatre started out with that, primarily. That is the function of the theatre, to interpret human beings to each other, to interpret human beings from A to Z. Audiences will impersonate themselves in the very actors that are playing and the whole crowd together will feel and respond en masse, and that has value, we believe and we have been taught and told in the old saying of the Gospels—"where two or three are gathered together"—when there is an instinct for some fine thing, there is a spirit present which will lead men away from their personal selves and sink them, or rather raise them up into a larger self, the self of his community, the self of his country, the self of something larger than just his own little personality.

But now, I want to lead on from that application to what the theatre does stand for, as distinct from the cinema. Now, we are in this present age, almost slaves of machinery. We are glad that there is such a thing as machinery to give us our regular everyday, common or garden needs. We are grateful for things that have been done in machines so that human effort may be released from frightful drudgery and may turn to things, better things of the mind, and things which will raise them higher. That good thing has been and is being perverted. We find, with our entertainment throughout the world, a tendency and more than a tendency—it is a thing that has almost become a settled fact— to let everybody else do the work for us.

We have these two great mechanized things, the cinema, the radio, gramaphones, and all sorts of second hand art is handed to us, which requires no personal effort on the part of the person or the audience, on the person who is supposed to be participating in that art. No personal effort is required at all.

Now, there is no art, worthy the name of art, that does not require from the listener, from the participator, some personal effort. A man said to me the other day, a man in New York, a very fine, intelligent man, he said:

"Do you know, I can't tolerate this theatre much more. It seems to me such a childish thing."

I said, "Yes, that is a terrific reproach. A childish thing. And I think we have become quite childish in lots of things we do put forward in the theater, but the thing which is a terrific reproach to the child, the thing which means an intolerable thing, the thing which is selfish, which wants things for itself, we call childish. The thing which belongs to the child, which we know is the very finest thing we can have, the child-like thing, is imagination, a power of seeing some things of the spirit which we grow too old to see, we in the world."

It always strikes me as a very wonderful sentence in a book of G. K. Chesterton's—he was talking about the lovely surprise of God. He made a flowery thought and he said, "How lovely". "I must make another one. We men get tired; we men get bored with doing the same thing day after day, for we have sinned and grown old and our Father is younger than we." And it strikes me that that is a very fine text for the theatre. The theatre stands for something which is to keep our childlikeness, our youth.

Now, if you want to keep a thing which is young, if you want to keep a thing which is youthful, you have to make some effort about it. The tendency of the whole of our personal lives is to get older, to get more settled, to get less bodily free and we who are in the middle age, know how we have to struggle quite hard to keep our bodies and our selves fit so we may do the much more work that comes on us as we get to that middle age. The sort of thing we have to prevent is the 'middle age spread'—the great effort people will take after bath in the morning and other times of the day, a real effort to keep something which is childlike, to keep their youth in their physical being.

Well, there is another part of us which is much more important than just that body which is only an outward expression of the inward thing and that is the most precious thing we have got, our imagination. And it is to keep your imagination childlike that the theatre exists. The theatre exists to keep us always surprised, always enquiring, always wanting to find some new aspect, always wanting to see some new point of view, to keep our minds, our mentalities, flexible, not willing to be settled.

I often think what we call the devil in life—you can call him by all sorts of different names—I think the devil is mainly seen in dullness and the devil—I call it the devil, you know what I mean—the devil wants to get us settled, to get us encrusted with something so we can't move—so different from the thing which is alert and excited and thrilling and always surprised, always ready to make new things, always ready to make the old things again and again, with little changes, little new views. Always, the whole of life is something that is trying to encrust us, trying to stunt us, trying to prevent growth, putting a fungus—the devil is another word for fungus to me—something which grows over you and prevents you being elastic, moving, growing large. And it is this thing which the theatre exists to combat.

Now, nothing of imagination is just of nature. If we leave imagination alone, the devil of dullness and encrusting will come and get over it. So many people have said to me, "Why, this fuss about things like the theatre? Why can't we just go to the theatre when we feel like it and sit more or less dozily, or just as we like. Why do you make all this fuss about it?" Because you will never get what you want from an art which has that valuing. You will never get from it anything that will be of real value unless effort is made, unless a real vigorous effort is made, and that is the main difference between the art of the theatre and the art of the cinema. The cinema has pandered to this devil of dullness. It has pandered to this thing which wants us to make no effort, which wants us to sit still.

Look at any growing thing you leave out in the sun. Leave it anywhere where things grow quickly. Before long a delicate tender thing will be crushed over by things. There is nothing that we want to grow beautiful that has not to be made an effort over, that has not to be cared for, nurtured tenderly, and our imagination is one thing which we can get just crushed and stifled.

Now, the cinema and the gramaphone, all these mechanical things, are the most wonderful aids to our becoming old men and women, (applause) to losing that power which is of a child, which wants to make effort, which doesn't want to sit on its haunches on a chair and say, "Go on, amuse me. Go on, amuse me." That sort of thing is the beginning of death and if a child sits on a chair and says, "Go on, show me something," or doesn't say anything at all but sits like a piece of suet, we think, "Poor darling, what is the matter with it?" There is something wrong if it doesn't ask questions; something is wrong if it doesn't find out and pick about in all sorts of unexplored corners and something is very definitely wrong with a man or woman who wants entertainment without effort. (Applause.)

I do see at the head, the logical conclusion of this cinema machine, effortless making world that we are coming into, a most ghastly, ghastly finish, a most boring, deadly finish. Our lovely games you are all so keen on, you will see played—well, it is coming that way, very vigorusly—you see the games played on a sheet and you watch your football games—or whatever you do watch—being performed on a sheet. You don't sometimes, have to go to the field to watch it—you don't make that much effort! I have seen people sitting watching our test matches, sitting in a chair, frightfully comfortable in front of a thing which is asserting that so-and-so made these many runs. Very nice—if they haven't got legs. Lovely. But it seems to me the most frightful thing that we should want everything without locomotion. If we don't want personal locomotion and metaphorical locomotion in our spirit, somehow, something that makes us want to probe and find out ourselves, that would be all right.

Now, the cinema knows what the public wants. So does the radio. All of them know what we want. On the face of us, what we want is comfort, and if we don't watch all the time, I think anybody would feel that way. With me—I am a pretty alive person, physically, but I know what it is to feel, "What an effort; what a nuisance to do this! How lovely if I could just have it in my room at the moment." That is something one definitely has to fight, something which is lethargic, the most awful monster of death and it comes and seizes on us and gives us all sorts of lovely excuses, such as, "O, well, I am fifty. I don't see why I should have to do this." In Heaven's name, after you have had fifty years of making your body free and your mind free, you ought to be more alert and able to do more, instead of getting all stodgy and encrusted and cabined. It is this thing we have to watch continuously and continuously, to see that it doesn't encroach and eat us up. The cinema has done this lovely thing for us: it will start a programme early in the morning and will go on, perhaps, solidly, all day long, so you don't even have to make the effort of being in time.

The main essential of dramatic performance, which is a rite, if found in the deepest instincts in man, that thing which once symbolized some deep feeling of its own, symbolized in humans, symbolized in dramatic shape—the Greeks knew it so well and used it as a public releasing of its people, a great mind-releasing thing—the essence of a public performance of drama is that it is a rite—a r-i-t-e rite—a thing which is performed at the moment. It is participated in by the audience at the moment, and the element of surprise that is in it is missing in the cinema—the thing which is a danger. Any moment, somebody in the gallery may throw a rotten egg on the stage. That is only a little, tiny thing that might happen. There are all sorts of surprises that might happen. Something can quicken an actor so much in the audience that he will give a performance he didn't know he had it in him to give. Something may happen of such devastating awfulness in an audience that there will be complete collapse. It is a thing of danger, being held in sort of balance—it may go over, it may be entirely wrecked, it may be the most superb thing. Without that element of danger, the main thing which makes a dramatic performance is missing. You may throw any amount of eggs you like at a screen, but nothing happens, except that the screen gets a little dirty. It goes on in the same way. The actress goes through her lovely love scenes and all goes on just the same; instead, when the egg is thrown at you on the stage, a metaphorical egg, and you rise and give something huge. You have something roused in you which only the egg roused, perhaps, and you give something else. They go out, having a bath, not perhaps of the egg, but some emotion created between you all, and you will be raised, lifted, released and bathed and somewhat freed from this thing which goes on in the same little, stodgy, everyday way, the thing which happens to be at the moment the thing which has got to be watched and guarded against.

There must discipline if a thing is going to give you as much as the theatre can give you, a thing which is going to develop and release something in you which may have gone dead. It is a very easy thing to say the theatre is for childish people—it does belong to something of children. It does belong to youth and that thing which is enquiring and which longs to probe, but without being as children we don't get anywhere. We don't get to see the things we are hoping to see. Our eyes aren't opened and this thing which happens at the moment is our own performance. That is what you don't get with a cinema. You never get your own performance. The thing we give, that we feel as actors in the performance of "The Distaff Side" in Toronto is different to what we give in Boston. Something that Toronto gives to us we are handing back to Toronto; something that Boston gives us we hand back to Boston. They are different things.

Now, when you have your lovely Greta Garbos and your Ronald Colemans, and the beautiful stars who do such lovely work—and I just adore their work—there is not one thing you do here in Toronto that will have its effect on them. They don't take into their work something that Toronto is giving because actors don't come only to give, they don't come only to give to you, they come to take too. So, the sum makes up something—we come to perform a rite. We come to interpret something and in our interpretation is only half of what a dramatic performance is. We give our interpretation and you give some essentials of yours which makes it a different thing, not only a different thing here in Toronto from New York, but in Toronto a different thing, every single night. There is not two performances we give, one like ours at the moment, for instance, that we give exactly the same way. There is something in the audience that it is giving us differently. You could hear us when we come off the stage, night after night, "Wasn't it difficult to get that line? They didn't see that at all tonight. Last night they got it quickly and we were given something to carry it on and give the other thought out quickly. Funny, tonight something seems to draw us out." Another night: "I feel fifteen feet tall tonight." Those people are giving them something bigger than they expected to get. That is the essence of dramatic performance; that is the power the theatre has in the world.

We are all in the world now, wanting to get in tune with each other. That is the great problem of nations at the moment—trying to find something which makes us understand our fellow nations, our brothers and sisters of various kinds and colours. The theatre is one way and a very deep, instinctive way of being able to find something out about other people. I was talking to a man right up in the wilds of Queensland. He had come in from one of the farms and there was a certain play we were playing and he said, "It is funny, I didn't realize that at all, that you people in England feel just the way we do right out here in the wilds. I never thought that; I thought we were a thing by ourselves up here in Queensland." He couldn't travel; he couldn't see anything. By dramatic performance you can give an essence of people, show it to other people, make them see whether they are in tune with that and they will learn understanding.

There is that very, very good example—I have used this before, but I do think it is such a good one: The Irish people who express themselves in their plays, with the exception of the Russians, I should think, as no other people in the world express themselves—something of their very essence goes into their drama. It is almost their natural art—expression; at least it is expression that comes very nearly to them. We have learned, we people in our part of the British Empire, in England we have learned and are trying to understand something about the Irish people, which we should never have done by just newspaper talk and by our little antagonisms. We do have a lot of antagonisms because the Irish people and the English people are very different, tempermentally, but by an art, you go down to the fundamental, down into something which is deeply in tune with those human beings and it is in the excrescencies where you are far apart. In our outward expressions of life we may be a long way apart but right back in the centre, in the core, we are in tune.

In that play, "Juno and the Paycock"—they are purely Irish people. My goodness, isn't that us? Isn't that something we do, too? Something you find in tune, and by your likenesses to people you learn to understand them and care for them. If you get that first, the something in common which is understanding, the outside thing, the excrescencies—the differences may amuse and entertain, it is by our likenesses to people that we understand and care for them, and by our differences we are amused and that is true with other nations; there are things in us which deeply are the same as Japan and China and India, and Africa, all human beings have something which is deeply in common. It is our outsides that are different. We want to find a thing which is in common. Dramatic performance is a concentrated presenting of people to themselves.

It is a very queer thing, when I was over in this country years ago, in every place—this is particularly in the States because I didn't travel so extensively here, there weren't enough places where they took dramatic performances—in an enormous number of places in the States, small places which I visited then, there is now no theatre, no dramatic people allowed in at all. No theatres, possibly. We used to go and find big publics and good publics, and now there are very few that are playing at all. This is really quite a big loss.

The cinema and the radio and the gramaphones, they are all fine if they are leading us on to a personal art, leading us on to an art in which we actively participate.

I was talking to one of the gramaphone makers the other day and I said, "You ought to make a rule that nobody shall have any musical records who does not try and learn something about music." Nobody can get any real pleasure from an art unless they work at it themselves.

The other day I was playing up at Leeds and I went into a restaurant to get a poached egg before my performance at night. I was sitting there and to my amazement, suddenly I heard a gramaphone or a programme from a radio station near, playing the Toccata in D, from Bach. People were clattering their cups, going on eating poached eggs and sausages, and the Toccata in D is being played and no one cares! It might be a stupid bit of ear-catching sound. I felt, what a terrible thing this is! What a dreadful thing it is, that we can let a thing be played in such a place, that one ought to go on one's knees and walk on one's knees a mile to hear and participate in what the Toccata in D can do for you.

Christmas Day, my husband and I tuned in and heard a bit of Bach's Passion, from Dresden or Munich—I can't quite remember which—little odd bits of Bach's Passion. That radio could be switched on or off—you listened or you didn't. People were talking during it. When I thought of what the Bach's Passion meant, when I thought of what it meant to a musician, when one studied it and worked at every note and then the great day came when you could go and hear Bach's "St. Matthew's Passion" what an experience it was! And here we have just allowed it to be thrown off and on every occasion. Pearls in front of swine, it comes to. (applause). Ladies and Gentlemen, please don't think I am saying an offensive thing, because I say it to myself, most rigorously. It is a thing we have got to watch in the world, so very rigorously now, this paying nothing of ourselves for the beauties that we have got, and letting our children grow up—I wouldn't let my children have a gramaphone until they learned the piano and showed they were working at it. I wouldn't let them have the sound of a gramaphone. They have no right to, unless they are going to spend some effort themselves.

It is just the same way with the theatre. Nobody has any business to come to a theatre and sit as they do at the cinema, like suet, and sit and not move, not have every nerve out ready to be impressed, to be moved, and you will say, "O, yes, but look at the stuff you give us sometimes." True, we do give some stuff, sometimes, in the theatre, but there is not a single play, if you are atune—I speak as an actress and that is a little different, but everybody ought to be actors—there is not a single play that you can't find something in it of a door opened. It doesn't have to be, necessarily, intelligent because we have other things besides intelligence that want to be aroused and moved, and emotionally, we want stirring.

Do you know, it is lovely to see how spoon fed the public is in this art, how childishly they are treated, how they are so afraid their sensibilities are going to be hurt. I think, rather than being careful what they see, we should shock them! Shock them! Give them something that drives them up like bombs. I think that is what we want. We can't be cared for in that way. We care for ourselves far too much. We are much too eager not to be churned up, and, particularly us British people. For goodness' sake, don't make me feel! That is the cry of so many of our British people. It stands us in good stead, sometimes. That is what the theatre should do; it should churn us up, shock us, give us a new point of view and we think then what we can be. We don't attempt to solve problems on the stage or say that this is the line of conduct or that is the line of conduct. We say, this is life as we see it, some part of life as the artist is seeing it, and if it is a thing which is terrible, then it is the business of the church to come in and say, "Hello, what is this? This is an aspect of life we didn't know existed." Attack the cause, not the thing that is the expression of it. The expression of it is throwing it off.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I must stop, because it is dreadful, I know. This watch, you (The President) talked about, tears on. It has been a real pleasure to come and meet with people. I know there is a live public here and you have got in your midst a little theatre which is going to do things in the world, little Hart House which is going to show something of what life has thought and felt and discovered and expressed here in Toronto, something Toronto can give to the world, as what no other city in the world can give, something we in London, in Wales, wherever we are, have got, something to contribute, and we get nothing if we sit back without effort and don't participate. If there are failures, never mind, we can pick up the failures and criticize as much as we like. Criticism generally means that you stop going. Criticize as much as you like and the thing will grow, because it will be your own thing.

Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you very much for listening patiently like this and for giving me the opportunity to make these vague remarks. I feel that there is something in the theatre. I am very keen on it myself—there is something I love deeply in this theatre, that I have received from the theatre as a human being and I think every human being can receive something of quickening life, something that gives us understanding and growth. Don't let it die away. Don't let it just fizzle—and it is in your power, I know.

Thank you so much for letting me come. It has been a real pleasure to meet you all. (Applause, prolonged).

MANUFACTURING AS A PROFESSION

An Address by MR. ARTHUR B. PURVIS

Thursday, February 28, 1935

Before the guest speaker of the day, Mr. Arthur B. Purvis, was introduced, Mr. Dana Porter, the President, announced the appointment of the Nominating Committee, for the purpose of nominating the Executive to come into office for the coming year, as follows:

Dr. R. N. Burns
Mr. John D. Spence, K.C.
Mr. Ellis H. Wilkinson
Mr. James Armstrong
Mr. Beverley Matthews
Mr. W. M. Hargraft
Mr. Dana Porter, *the presiding President.*

Mr. Dana Porter: I have today a pleasant duty to perform. We have with us today, in addition to the speaker and guest of honour, Mr. Purvis, one of our members who has come back from Montreal, Major Baxter, the Past-President of this Club.

As you probably know, Major Baxter left Toronto some little time ago to take up his residence in Montreal, in association with McConnell and Fergusson, the same company with which he has been associated in Toronto, and I wish, on behalf of the Club to express our best wishes and all the feelings we have toward him as a result of our contact with him during his period as President of this Club. We know the Club went through some very difficult years, and perhaps the most difficult financial year of the Club was the year 1933-1934, over which Major Baxter presided with skill and tact.

I wish, therefore, on your behalf to express our appreciation of Major Baxter's services to the Club and our best wishes to him during his residence in Montreal. (Applause).

MAJOR BAXTER: Mr. President, Mr. Purvis, Gentlemen: Naturally, I am greatly surprised to have this tribute paid. I, at the same time, feel highly flattered and delighted that you should remember me so kindly. The finest thing I think that can happen to any man is to occupy the Presidency of The Empire Club. The chair honours the man, not the man honouring the Chair. Thank you very much for your good wishes. (Applause).

MR. DANA PORTER:—In one of Thomas Hardy's novels there is represented a Scotchman who being a long way from home used to sing songs which reminded him of his country and one of those songs went something in this way. "For, it's hame, and hame, and hame, I would fain be; Hame, hame, hame, to my ain countrie"—and he was so successful in his song, in arousing the emotions of his audience and rendering them so melancholy as the result of his being so far away from his own country, that one of the audience was moved to ask, "What did you come away from your own country for if it wounded you so much to do so?"

Now, we don't know why Mr. Purvis left Scotland, but perhaps we know that one of the reasons why he does stay away from it and is with us still, is because he has made himself indispensable and we won't let him go home.

Mr. Purvis is a Scotchman by birth. He has engaged in, as the representative, leading British industries in South Africa, South America and the United States and about ten years ago came to Canada where he entered into industry here and is now, as you know, the President of Canadian Industries, Limited. But, in addition to that, he has picked up several other Directorates, and some, I have since been informed, in addition to those mentioned on the notice card. So, we have Mr. Purvis today, Director of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, the Bank of Montreal, the Sun Life Insurance Company, The Canadian Safety Fuse Company, Limited, the Dunlop Tire and Rubber Goods Company of Canada, General Motors Corporation, and, perhaps, some other companies that have not been brought to my attention.

The subject on which Mr. Purvis proposes to speak is "Industry as a Profession," and I think I may safely say that the reason why Scotchmen do make themselves indispensable when they go away from their own country is that they have that sense of fair dealing with every person with whom they come in contact, they have that very highest standard of accuracy and they are prepared to work just a little longer than anybody else. Mr. Purvis is one who has not made business a racket, but he has made business a profession. He will now address you on the subject, "Industry as a Profession."

MR. ARTHUR B. PURVIS: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: The reason that I left Scotland was because Scotland couldn't support me. In making the change the only claim that I have to put on record is that I chose well in coming to Canada. I have no desire to change back even to my own country, Scotland, and when a man can say that, I think he can say no more.

"The times are out of joint" and it behooves us all to express such convictions as may be growing upon us even though, under more normal conditions, we should prefer to remain silent. I have chosen as the subject matter of my talk with you today, "Manufacturing as a Profession." However, before it is possible to reach such particular suggestions as I may have to make in that regard, it is necessary to outline the general conditions with which we are faced in order to paint the background upon which, as I see it, any effort in industrial life has at this time to be superimposed.

In the ordinary course it might be unnecessary to attach much weight to this background, and we could, instead, confine ourselves to considering strictly what manufacturers can do in their own particular field to help the situation. However, particularly in North America, the attack on depression problems at the present time seems to be based on a general theory that industry has overbuilt; has in effect, therefore, mortgaged the progress of the next decade; and that since we can, as a result, expect little revival in the near future, our main efforts, in common decency when so many are in want, should be bent not towards increasing the sum total of goods available but towards the more equitable division of those already in existence.

I believe this is a fundamentally wrong conception; that in actual fact at the present time the scientific knowledge already available to us clearly demonstrates there is a greater field of activity immediately available than at any previous time; and that, therefore, every effort should be bent towards producing that state of mind in industry as a whole which will encourage it to go forward with confidence and take risks in adapting these new scientific ideas to the needs of our population.

You may ask what are these possibilities that are immediately before us. I would say that there is available enough scientific progress in the fields of modernization of the houses in which we live and in the air-conditioning of those houses; in the modernization of railway equipment; in the field of the aeroplane and in improvements even in the automobile industry—far as it has gone in recent years—to keep us all busy for a considerable time to come. Developments along such new lines do not, however, flourish unless there is confidence in the future and we have, therefore, to make up our minds whether we do believe in that future or not. It may very well be that some few individuals have obtained a larger share than their contribution warranted, but surely that is relatively unimportant and is in any case no reason for discouraging the efforts of those who have the ability to increase the total available. "Carving never increased what is on the platter."

Apart from the necessity of settling in our minds this fundamental point, for some time past it has become increasingly evident that there is a greater and greater disposition to regard the depression through which we are now passing as something completely novel in type, involving a recognition that the system, as we have known it, must be entirely changed. And, curiously enough, this viewpoint has been established in the minds of many, simply as a result of experiences during the short period from 1930 onwards, since for some years before that time it was currently stated, and believed by many, that the economic system under which we work had achieved a new level which had emancipated mankind (so far as North America, at least, was concerned) from its old trials and tribulations. To my mind neither the boom nor the depression view portray anything but the tendency of human nature to put too great emphasis on a purely temporary position, for in the life of nations such periods as those in question are of course negligible.

The belief that the current difficult period is merely different from previous depression periods in degrees alone is borne out by reference to the history of depressions which succeeded previous great wars. The difference in degree resulted, first, from the fact that the last war embraced so large an area as to exempt no important nation the wealth of which could be drained to rehabilitate the whole; second, from the fact that the improvement in communication and transportation has led to so much greater a degree of economic interdependence amongst the nations as to bring about much more damaging repercussions from any disturbance in these relations; and, third, from the fact that the wave of post-war stock market speculation in this instance embraced, owing to the brokerage facilities available, a much wider section of the population.

As a matter of interest we can turn to the accounts available of earlier conflicts.

In the case of the American Revolutionary War, the panic of 1791 did not take place until eight years after the signing of peace. In the case of the subsequent War of 1812, it came five years after the signing of peace, namely, in 1819. The situation in the United States at that time is described by James Trusloe Adams much as follows:

> "Hysterical legislation, commercial and financial derangement due, as post-war panics are, to the war itself, a panic coming a considerable number of years after peace was signed, wide-spread bank collapses—federal finance tinkering, government investments—stupendous—in bankrupt enterprises the world over."

In the case of the Napoleonic War the *Edinburgh Review* in 1816 said:

> "During the last twelve or eighteen months, however, the country has been suffering severely in every direction; its home trade and foreign commerce. The return of peace after unexampled victories has brought no relief but has rather confirmed our apparent ruin, and all classes of men more or less feel the effects of some hidden rottenness in our system, the causes of which no one seems able to discover, much less to remove."

Again the *Bradford Observer*, blaming the American Civil War, the wars between Prussia and Austria in 1866 and between France and Germany in 1870 and 1871, in 1878 described conditions as follows:

> "Let us summarise the causes of the complaints which are by no means confined to this country. A succession of wars, excessive armaments, and increased taxation: an unhealthy speculation subsequent to an extraordinary displacement of capital; a fictitious prosperity and exaggerated rate of wages and a spirit of extravagance pervading all classes; the reaction intensified by enormous losses on investments on Turkish,

> Egyptian and sundry South American bonds, no less than in joint stock undertakings at home, which all promised large dividends and ended in failures; famine in the East occuring at the same time when a fall of 20 per cent. in the value of silver disorganised one of our most important markets; and lastly, the failure of banks and firms in consequence of an inflation of credit beyond all previous precedents."

Even in the case of the smaller Boer War, by December 1902 England was suffering from depressed conditions and the *Saturday Review* said:

> "At the beginning of the winter the ordinary distress which prevails amongst those whose occupations are affected by the season is likely to be intensified by the general decline in industry and trade which has been making its influence felt for some time and will in the course of the ensuing year most probably approach to something like a crisis . . . There can be no war that does not disorganise the labour market; and one of the features of the present distress which has attracted particular attention is the case of the Reservist who, even if trade had not declined, would have found themselves seeking for situations which had already been occupied. It is easy to understand how the artificial stimulus which war supplies to certain branches of industry is succeeded by the natural reaction and lethargy when it is removed. Thus in ironworks, and shipyards and dockyards trade becomes dull, almost comes to a standstill and men have to be discharged."

This seems proof enough that our present situation is far from new in type.

Coming back to the present postwar crisis, I am reminded of a talk I had with a prominent American in the middle of 1932. At that time, you will remember, elections were impending in the United States, and I had asked him as to the business outlook there. The reply—that of an older man — was somewhat illuminating. He paralleled the times they were going through with one of the more serious depressions suffered by the United States—in 1893—the conditions of which he well recollected. He stated that at that time, with the worst of the depression force spent, it became a race between quack remedies liable to be introduced to meet the popular demand for an ending of the depression, and the forces tending towards that normal recovery which it has been found can in any depression sooner or later be relied upon to assert itself. At the time Mr. William Jennings Bryan was the proponent of the most popular quack remedy, and was endeavouring to win the election on the cry of "Free-Silver." Mr. Bryan stumped the country in favour of his "Reform" of the currency. Fortunately, he could only address some 10,000 people a week, with the result that the lure of the "easy road out" did not reach sufficient numbers in sufficient time. The natural recovery set in, and, automatically, Mr. Bryan and his silver reforms were overnight forgotten. My informant—bear in mind this was in the middle of 1932—likened the position of the United States in 1932 to its position in 1893, and stated his fear was that the publicity enjoyed by the opportunist type of politician in reaching vast numbers through the medium of the radio might bring about the reverse result on this occasion, before natural recovery could be counted on to show up and head off the disaster. In the light of the situation now obtaining in the United States, the view then expressed showed unusual perspicacity.

Since that date we in Canada, avoiding in large degree the series of quack remedies introduced in the United States, have seen a steady improvement in economic conditions. This improvement manifested itself in Canada very definitely in May, 1933, and the forces of natural recovery have continued ever since. Even the durable goods industry showed appreciable improvement in 1934, though, from experience in previous depressions, we know there is generally a two years' lag in that field as compared with the secondary industries, and we cannot, therefore, expect a material change for the better in durable goods until around the middle of this year. As to whether this improvement is imminent or not, I, for one, have no doubt, for the grim, but in this case helpful, factor—obsolescence—is taking its score unseen but relentlessly, and, if confidence can be maintained in Canada, will now very quickly contribute its quota to the natural recovery.

It would be comforting to think that we can count on all being well in a comparatively short time. There is one contrary factor, however, referred to incidentally above, and that is that in this particular depression the damage has been spread over a greater world area. Unfortunately, also, the tendency as a result of war-debt burdens has been for the nations to move along more nationalistic paths in recent years, and this just at the very time when international recovery required an opposite trend in order to stimulate a freer flow of commodities between the various countries. There is a limit to what any one country can do in recovering its normal comforts until this international situation rights itself. And however well, therefore, we conduct our affairs at home it may be we shall find ourselves pausing in the upturn at some point until the barriers to restoration of trade between nations begin to break down.

Meantime, we have a dangerous period ahead of us in our domestic affairs. This arises in the main from the inevitable tendency of human nature in periods of stress, first, to find scapegoats for its sufferings, and, second, to assume simple solutions are possible for what are really very complex problems, as a corollary favouring leaders who claim to be able, at a stroke, to cure maladies which do not yield in fact to quick treatment because they are founded in deep-laid causes.

It is exactly at this point that the quality of character and mind of our people, and of those whose duty it is to guide them, becomes most important. Should the demagogue with his quack remedies win in Canada, the standard of living will inevitably be lowered for every citizen because of the resultant lack of confidence, and of the discouragement of the constructive forces of leadership, which forces represent after all the greatest asset any people has in achieving efficiencies and, therefore, in increasing the sum total of goods available for division amongst us all.

At this point one cannot help marvelling at the cruelty towards the rank and file of the nation—unconscious cruelty in the case of the sentimentalist genuinely obsessed with the hard lot of the "under dog", and, perhaps, more conscious in the case of many of those who use the crisis to endeavour to set class against class in an effort to destroy the system—of those who raise false hopes of easy and quick cures for problems which have their seat in human failings. Such men are the opportunists in the national life, and in a movement towards opportunism, as distinct from adherence to principles, lies the present menace to the well-being of our people. To an industrialist who knows that in business ventures the path of opportunism is the path to bankruptcy, it sometimes seems that in no field is opportunism so rife as in the field of politics—that expression of the successes and failures of us all. Our need is for statesmen, not politicians, and by statesmen I mean men founded in principles.

Canada through the merits of her people, and with the help of as effective a political leadership as has been enjoyed during the depression by any nation in the world, has handled herself excellently so far, and, as can be seen from the League of Nations report, has economically done as well as, and in most cases very much better than, almost any other nation—within the limits that are within her own control and are not dependent upon the policies of other countries.

True, the voice of the people has not been insistent enough to bring about a situation where that national sore —the railway problem—has yet to be dealt with. True, also, that the policy in handling the wheat crop may well cause misgivings to those friends of the farmers who know the advantages of retaining a good market for one's product, as distinct from endeavouring to regain it after it has been lost to competitors. And, again, it is true that as a country we still suffer badly from the expenses involved in unnecessary duplication of Government. Unfortunately, in some of these respects the tendency is to avoid the arduous task of informing opinion along the lines necessary to produce in the public mind an insistence on the cure of these ills—without which cure the more thinking of us know that, sooner or later, our country must fall behind in the race to produce better conditions for its people.

Nevertheless, the record of Canadian recovery to date is impressive beyond measure. What of the future? For, with an election impending, we know we are necessarily in greater danger of following the wrong road. Here, fortunately, Canada is free from the necessity of undertaking her own experiments. Before her in the last decade, due to war unrest, there have unrolled experiments on an unparalleled scale and of widely divergent types, and in some cases the outcome of these experiments can already be foreseen. Will Canada learn from these? Or will her people permit themselves to be used as "guinea pigs" for a large scale experiment, with all its admitted dangers of disaster to her standards of living?

What lessons are already available to us? In the first of the post-war experiments in Russia, from which many of us hoped for a real contribution to the working out of social problems, an effort to remake the world overnight without reference to human failings; an effort to undertake the control and planning of practically every human activity is, we are credibly informed, being transformed into an experiment in State, as distinct from private, capitalism, and, in the meantime, in the lust for power of a small group, has been accompanied by cruelties to whole sections of the population worse than any charged against private capitalism by its worst enemies.

In Italy, we see a leader of unusual ability and force of character who has undertaken to re-inculcate, and has achieved a fair measure of success in re-inculcating, self-respect into a great people—in the process, however, adding enormously to the burden of public debt—and who has placed such emphasis on obedience to the State as to stake everything in the future upon the chance that there may be another leader of equal ability to guide the affairs of the nation when he disappears.

In Germany, we have the example of a war-suffering people, temporarily almost deranged by the extent of their problems, depositing those problems on the door-step of a dictator whose course of action has aroused grave misgivings in the minds of the world at large.

Coming nearer home, in the United States we have in the last two years seen the arrival of the quack remedy on a colossal scale. However sincere and well-intentioned the effort may be, the spectacle of such a great nation branching out on untried ground in an effort to take the more acceptable course from the viewpoint of the man in the street, namely, to buy back prosperity with unlimited expenditures from the public purse, is, to say the least, alarming. The effort there has included such steps as deliberate monetary manipulation in an effort to adjust the debt burden of individuals by influencing the price level, leading to the point where in the recent Supreme Court decision we saw a reprimand to Congress itself for having invalidated its own obligations; active intervention in the running of industry by the Government itself; and a rapid increase in the national debt pointing to still heavier increases in taxation in the early future to serve that debt. Further, these steps have been accompanied by a severe arraignment in the public eye of industrial and financial leadership without discrimination between good and bad leadership; and the creation of a belief on the part of labour that its interests and those of capital are irreconcilable. The result of these measures has been a rapid increase in the area of stagnation in the durable goods industries, owing to the growing lack of confidence in the future on the part of industrial leaders, and a progressive disintegration in the character of the people through the discouragement of thrift. Accompanying all these experiments, we see gradually being built up a bureaucracy which through its voting power will tend to perpetuate itself whether performing useful service or not.

How unlike this course to that of the United Kingdom. While that country had suffered as much as any other country in the World War, faced with a national emergency arising out of the war which had driven the country off its traditional adherence to the gold standard, a national government was formed in the realization that the two-party system could no longer hope to do what was necessary to help bring about recovery at the maximum possible speed. Immediate steps were taken to balance the budget. Labour and capital were encouraged to co-operate in the common cause. Industry was also encouraged to formulate for itself—a most vital point—plans for rationalization and reorganization; with the understanding that the Government would examine those plans with the aid of the truly excellent civil service organization built up over many years with men of the highest calibre; and would then decide if and where it could support those plans by Government action; thereafter encouraging industry to put them into effect. Hence a state of confidence has been built up in the industrial life of the country which has unleashed effort and put men to work, with particularly favourable effects in the construction field, and this despite the fact that there is a possibility of a bureaucratic socialistic government in the offing. My recent visit to England, coupled with visits to the United States, brought home to me most emphatically the contrast between the atmosphere of doubt and defeat in the United States and that of hope and confidence in the United Kingdom.

The lesson from all these experiments seems to be clear, i.e., that there is no easy way out; that opportunism only postpones the evil day, and that, to survive, we in Canada must work through old and tried principles which from the experience of the ages we know can be depended upon in due course to bring results, while, in the meantime, we must care for the less fortunate members of society until those results have been achieved.

So much for the general lessons available to us as a Nation. Does this mean that there is nothing for us to do in the field of industry to see that the sufferings of this depression result in the maximum forward movement obtainable? For we must recognize that the cry for reform of industry comes from the natural public reaction, not only to a major depression in itself—the inevitable outcome of the World War—but also to certain failings in the handling by industry of industry's problems.

At this stage I should like to emphasize my conviction that, if we are to harness to the maximum extent the endeavours of human beings to solve their economic problems, it is vital that the economic system should maintain a continuous and automatic urge upon every individual to improve his material welfare so as to provide him with the opportunity to develop himself and his physical and mental enjoyments to the highest degree, and, in my belief, it has been the automatic nature of the pressure exerted on individuals through the medium of the profit incentive motive which has made possible the truly marvellous forward strides which have been achieved in the standard of living in the more civilized countries. Nearly everyone will admit that in the field of production, where it is, perhaps, easier than in the distribution field to harness the advantages provided by scientific progress, our problems are today, in the main, already solved, and this solution has been arrived at precisely as a result of that constant pressure automatically directing the effort of human individuals along the same general lines. We now have a similar task before us in the field of distribution, where the attack is not advantaged so quickly through scientific improvement. But that these distribution problems will yield to the constant pressure of self-interest under the profit incentive motive I, for one have no doubt.

What is the alternative to this system, the machinery of which is constantly lubricated by the profit incentive urge? To accept as a substitute theoretical planning by inexperienced reformers who, without ever having earned the right amongst their peers to be judged successful in handling the practical problems involved in human relations, expect us to accept their promises that they have such unique ability as to be able to direct the infinitely complex industrial and financial relations of individuals and communities by telling each one of us what to do at every hour of the day? Were we all "robots" this might work, but as human beings we know it will not, and certainly such national experiments as have recently been made available to us confirm the conviction that such a road is a false one. Nor is it reasonable to suppose that the passing over of our problems of governmental control will develop a breed of supermen more capable to handle these problems than the present breed.

But let us assume for the moment that in Canada at least we shall not try to swap horses in the middle of such a fast-running and treacherous portion of the stream, and that the intention will be to encourage efficiency and success where it is achieved on sound and fair lines. In that case, what can industry do to meet the legitimate side of the cry for reform, to which I have referred?

Here I must speak primarily from my experience in the manufacturing world. And my answer is that in that world we must ourselves make more definite moves towards the provision of an ethical background similar to that which has been more successfully built up in the professions. All sound growth comes from within, and the alternative of coercion from without is a poor substitute.

It is up to the manufacturer, therefore, himself to define to a greater extent the principles on which he intends to work, since once those governing principles are defined, the handling of his day-to-day problems becomes relatively simple. It is then also up to industry to police its own system to see that those principles are maintained.

In this regard, we are suffering today to some considerable extent from the loss of the generation missing as a result of the War. Indeed, every generation makes its own contribution towards the improvement of standards in industry, and in my lifetime an impressive change has come over the attitude in manufacturing life. In the old days, the interests of the owners of business were considered paramount. For many years there has been an increasing tendency on the part of the manufacturer to recognize that to justify his existence he must see that his operations redound to the benefit of the community as a whole. And most hopefully, insofar as its augury for the future is concerned, this new feeling has come about from within industry in the form of a growing conviction on the part of management that this attitude to the community also actively pays the owner interest. But, whereas a considerable amount of progress in our standards of manufacturing is evident, it is also true that, in many cases, leaders used to the outlook of earlier times have had to carry on until the gap in leadership due to the War losses closes up, and, naturally, for this reason industry has not developed so forward an outlook as otherwise would have been possible. It is all the more important, therefore, that at this time a special effort be made, no only to define and develop those standards, but to do it in such a way as to provoke the enthusiasm of the younger men now building themselves into the structure, by encouraging them to make in their turn, and as early as possible, their contribution of suggestions for improvement in the governing principles to be observed in handling manufacturing problems, emphasizing with them, in the meantime, the necessity for adhering at all costs to such principles as are established at any given time.

I accept fully and without reservation the implication that, where as manufacturers we fail to pay proper regard to the public weal, we should expect and look for Government regulation. But of one thing I am certain—the extent of the Government regulation imposed upon us is, and will always be, the measure of our own failure.

Not but what the chief loser from industry's failings and errors has been capital itself. This fact that capital is the "goat", and not the ordinary citizen, is often overlooked—in fact, from current comment on our economic affairs, one would hardly guess that while capital spent goes at least in the proportion of eighty cents to the dollar to wages—investments in capital projects, whether good or bad, therefore resulting in good business and employment for the working man—these activities frequently represent losses to the investor. This misunderstanding is caused perhaps by the tendency to note the earnings of industry in good times only, leaving out of account the fact that, particularly in depression periods, most industrial ventures have to take into their books gigantic capital losses arising from the factor of obsolescence of equipment and processes, which offset in large measure the previous earnings.

As I see it, the more general obligations of the manufacturer are fourfold, i.e., to the consumer, to the employee, to the stockholder and to the Government, and principles should therefore be laid down governing such obligations.

The first point with which I will endeavour to deal is the attitude of the manufacturer towards the consumer. Obviously, in a very competitive situation, selling prices find a level which takes care of the consumers' interest, even if at times the result is detrimental to other sections of the community, such as the investor and the wage-earner. However, where large-scale operation is involved, and a large share of the total market is obtained with corresponding cost efficiencies, the manufacturer must accept the principle of sharing the economies from that large-scale operation with the consumer in the form of lower selling prices. Here it may be well to remark that, in my view, a so-called monopoly, held in check by its vulnerability against concerted action by consumers, can serve the public well and offer many of the advantages of free competition simultaneously with the economies of concentration.

The question of tariff then arises. Tariff protection, as I see it, is intended to accomplish two purposes:

1. To enable manufacturing ventures to pass safely through their earlier stages with some measure of protection against dumping from similar industries long-established in other countries.
2. To permit manufacturing enterprises already established in a country to survive periods of unusual national stress, arising for instance, from some such a set of conditions as have obtained in the post-war period, when disturbances in the relationship of the currencies in different countries would, but for the shutting out of the flood of foreign goods, endanger the very existence of such local industries, even where these are both economically based and efficiently run.

As and when volume has been built up to the point where efficient costs of production have been achieved, and assuming that no abnormal international exchange or other situation exists, we, as manufacturers, should measure our success by the degree to which we are able to avoid using the tariff protection afforded us.

Tariff support, when accorded to the manufacturer, in my view also puts upon him the definite obligation, in considering the manufacture of new lines in Canada, to refrain from implanting these new industries unless there is a definite expectation, based on a close prior analysis of the situation, of arriving at an efficient operation within a reasonable number of years, an operation, in fact, which will not in normal times be dependent to any major degree upon tariff support.

Turning next to the principles governing the attitude to the employee, I suggest that, in the first place, there must be a broad recognition on the part of the manufacturer that labour should be so treated as to ensure its feeling itself a partner in production, not merely a tool of production. In the establishment of wage-rates the guiding principle should be to pay not less than the prevailing wage, recognizing, however, that this wage must in any case cover a reasonable standard of living and represent fair compensation for the work done.

Apart from the question of wages, we require the acceptance of the principle that the employer should, where and when profits are available, gradually build up protection for the employee against the vicissitudes of life, many of which even the thrifty workman cannot at this stage be expected to provide against. Another principle requiring acceptance is to provide means for periodical discussion with his employees of the problems which confront them. Here Works Councils, so successfully used in the United Kingdom, can well be adapted to our needs, providing, of course, these Works Councils operate in such a way as in the final analysis not to impair the authority of management, since on management devolves the ultimate responsibility for success or failure of the enterprise.

The third field has to do with the principles to be adopted towards the investor. This involves the necessity of recognizing the right of the investor to know that:

1. The issue to which he subscribes will be backed by actual assets and will not represent so-called "watered" stock, and
2. He will be kept posted by an adequate accounting system with the real facts relating to the operation of that investment.

The obligations to the Government belong in the main in the field of taxation. Here the situation is relatively simple. Neither tax evasion nor tax avoidance, even if legally possible, should in my view play any part in the manner in which we set up in our books our investment, our profits, or our reserves to meet the contingencies inherent in the business. Our books should, in fact, show the commercial picture as we genuinely estimate it to be in the particular line of manufacture in which we are interested. If we feel we are taxed unduly, our remedy lies in other and more constitutional efforts to demonstrate our beliefs to the proper authorities. By an acceptance of this principle, we shall not only be fulfilling our obligations to the Government but will, in addition, be able to count upon the efficiencies to be derived through the managing team—to whom the accounts are available in running the business—considering their problems and making their decisions on actual facts, undistorted by an accounting set-up induced by the desire to take every strictly legal means of avoiding taxes.

As an overhead principle which will provide a test of our sincerity of purpose in our relations with the consumer, the employee, the stockholder and the Government, I think we must accept a reasonably full measure of publicity as to our record. I realize, of course, that the manufacturer from time to time has forced upon him by actions outside his influence a course he would not himself choose. It is undoubtedly true that malpractices in promotion and in the field of investment banking have done serious harm to manufacturers, but here, in the final analysis, the remedy lies in the establishment of fair and proper principles by the men who work in those fields.

Whether in practice we adhere to such principles as I have outlined, and whether we will be willing to make sacrifices to achieve them, will, in the final analysis, rest upon the extent of our belief in their necessity as a requirement of our being allowed to continue to serve the community as at present, and, at the same time, make a fair profit from the satisfaction of its wants. I do not pretend that in setting them out I am putting before you anything which is very new. In one or other way most of us are observing these principles in the conduct of our manufacturing affairs. Nevertheless, I believe they should be stated more emphatically and clarified further as we go, so that there may always stand before us a record of what we are trying to work to, a record by which our later actions can be judged by those we serve, whether consumer, employee, stockholder or the Government.

I am afraid I have taken a good deal of your time. You will pardon me, perhaps, if I have. Thank you.

(Applause.)

CONDITIONS IN THE WEST

An Address by THE HON. JAMES GARFIELD GARDINER, Premier of Saskatchewan.

Friday, March 8, 1935.

Mr. Dana Porter: If there is one word which is more important than any other, having to do with progressive recovery, it is probably the word, confidence.

In the Province of Saskatchewan, they have borne the brunt, more than the people of any other province in this Dominion, of the tremendous fall in world prices. Yet, in the Province of Saskatchewan they, perhaps, have more confidence in themselves and in their future than the people of any other part of the Dominion.

Mr. Gardiner, our guest today, first went west during the drought of the nineties. He stayed west the major part of that drought but things became so dry that he eventually returned before the drought ended. On the occasion of the present drought, however, he has decided to stay because he found the drought of the nineties came to an end, so he has reason to believe that the drought of today is coming to an end.

Mr. Gardiner, Prime Minister of Saskatchewan, our guest today, will speak to us upon "Conditions in the West." Speeches on this subject have recently been all too infrequent in this part of the country and it is with great interest that we will listen to what he has to say. I have great pleasure in calling upon Mr. Gardiner.

The Hon. James Garfield Gardiner: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I had the privilege seven or eight years ago of speaking to The Empire Club in the City of Toronto. On a number of occasions since that time I have been honoured with an invitation to return and speak to the Club. It has not been my privilege to be in a position to accept that invitation until the present time and I consider it a privilege to be here now and have an opportunity of speaking upon the same subject upon which I spoke to you seven or eight years ago—"The Problems of the West."

I need hardly say that the problem, or that which appeared to be the problem of 1926 and '27, is not the problem of 1934 and '35. At that time our people seemed to be somewhat concerned that we had a land in the Western part of the Dominion of Canada, flowing with golden wheat into which we had invited the peoples of all nations and some were a little concerned to know as to whether the land was not a land intended for a chosen people. And after we had discussed the question before your Club, I, at least, had convinced myself, if not the members of the Club, that we had a population in Western Canada composed of persons from all the representative countries of Europe—men who came from Germany with its thrift and industry, men and women who came from the Scandinavian countries, who had been possessed throughout the ages with a desire to explore, men who came from France with their dashing bravery in times of war and chivalry in times of peace, and men and women who came from the British Isles, and those people who came from the so-called foreign countries were introducing into our west those elements which had built the British race into a people known for their desire to trade and to develop industry. We, in the West, thought at that time that we could rely upon the population that had been introduced into Western Canada standing up against all trials and tribulations that might come upon us from time to time. Today we look back, after the period intervening and I think I can say to the members of the Club, that none of us who were present on that occasion would have thought the people of Western Canada or Eastern Canada, for that matter, would have had to suffer all the trials and tribulations we have had to go through since the year 1928, or the year 1930. But I am certain of this, that we can say on this occasion, those of us who come from Western Canada, and I am sure those who reside in the East will agree with me, we can say the peoples of Western Canada have proven through that trying period, no matter what the nationality of their ancestors has been, that they are a people who can suffer trials and tribulations and still hold that spirit of optimism which has carried them down to the present moment. (Applause). Not only have they done that but I think we can say, in addition, and all agree, that the people of the central part of the great western plains, the people of the Province from which I come, have at the same time honoured the traditions of the British Empire, to which we belong and those institutions of government we all pride ourselves upon, have as great support in that part of the Dominion of Canada as in any other.

But today we are confronted by another problem. We have a new worry on our minds. Some of us are asking the question at the present time as to whether or not people should remain in that section of the country that some seven or eight years ago we considered to be flowing with a wealth that was only suited to a chosen people. Today we are wondering whether we should move people out of that area, whether we should go back to the conditions which existed there before our population was brought in, and if in any remarks I make today I can inspire confidence in the minds of men who have made investments in that part of the country, as to the future, I will consider my time has been well spent and I trust you will consider yours has, as well.

Now, in dealing with the problem I think it is essential we should all understand and I am sure many of you understand it now, but in case there may be some who do not, I am going to go over it more or less in a general way, that we should all understand the geographical structure of Western Canada and that we should understand, too, something of the physical geography of Western Canada. In order to place the picture before you, I want to say that what we know as the plain section of the Dominion of Canada, west of the Great Lakes, is in three well defined steppes, one being in the Red River Valley, with an average altitude of about 800 feet above sea level. As you proceed westward, before you reach the City of Brandon, you notice a range of hills which form the boundary line to the second steppe, which averages 1600 feet above sea level and extends to beyond the City of Regina; and as you approach Moose Jaw you again see what appears to be a range of hills forming the edge of the third steppe which extends from just west of the City of Moose Jaw to the foothills at the foot of the Rocky Mountains and that area which we sometimes speak of as the drought area or the semi-arid area of Western Canada is on the third of these steppes, the highest of all. Down in the Red River Valley you find the elm and the oak growing to considerable sizes. When you get on the second steppe, you find poplar and willow growing to much smaller sizes, but when you come to the third steppe, it is only under extraordinary conditions that exist here and there over that area that you find any tree growth whatsoever.

I wanted to give that review in order to indicate to you that we have a natural condition existing there and there are real definite boundaries to the different areas talked about when we are speaking of Western Canada.

I think, too, it is necessary that we should say something with regard to the general climate of that area before going on to discuss our greatest problem, of the moment, and I think I can probably deal with that question best by reciting to you some of the things that are taught to our students in our colleges and schools of Western and Eastern Canada, as well. Under the title, of Physical Geography, I was told in the days when I was a student going to school and no doubt many of you were, too, that the winds which are known as somewhat constant winds upon the earth are determined by two things: the turning of the earth upon its axis and the unequal heating of the earth's surface and that those of us who live in the northern hemisphere, whether we like it or not, have the influence of a constantly blowing western wind upon our climatic condition. Now, again, we know this: when winds are moving across oceans they lap up moisture and these westerly winds moving across the Pacific Ocean, lap up all the moisture their temperature will permit them to carry, but when they strike the Rocky Mountains and are driven upward going over the mountains, just to the west of the area I have been speaking about, that area which is south of Battleford and Saskatoon, in the Province of Saskatchewan, and south of Edmonton in the Province of Alberta, and extending down toward Winnipeg in the Province of Manitoba, when the wind comes over the mountains they have climbed to a height of over a mile and in climbing to this height where it passes through the mountains, they have lost the greater part of their moisture, with the result that they come into the plains to the east of the mountains as dry winds, sloping themselves to lower altitudes and therefore to climatic conditions where it is warmer and thus losing no moisture as they travel toward the east. Any man who has lived on the plains of Western Canada knows that probably at least three-quarters of the time the winds blow from the west and we have dry seasons during that particular period.

That is not so true of the country to the north. The Yellow Head Pass, where the Canadian National crosses the mountains is at no higher level than the City of Calgary, and as a result of the lower altitude of the passes in the northern areas, winds from the west do bring more moisture in and the moisture extends nearer to the foothills at those points than it does further south. But I think I can say this: As you pass over Western Canada from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains, in this area which is south of Saskatoon and south of Battleford, you are constantly coming into a little drier and a little drier area, the moisture being taken out of the winds from the east, rise over these different steppes and comes into the higher altitudes, so even an eastern wind, when you get into the third steppe, does not always bring rain with it and is quite often a dry wind.

I wanted to picture those conditions in order to indicate to you something of the problem we are up against if we are going to change the climate of Western Canada. To my mind there is only two ways you can do it: One is to level the Rocky Mountains, and the other is to cause the earth to turn the opposite way on its axis. I don't think even governments are going to try that.

Now, probably it would be well, when we are discussing the conditions in Western Canada to discuss the situation as we have it in so far as climate is concerned and to discuss the situation as we have it so far as the makeup of those different steppes are concerned. Now, I say this to you, that there is a question, and I think a question which has been decided in the minds of many people in Western Canada, as to whether it would do us any good to change the climate, even if we could do so. In order to illustrate what I mean by that, I am going to call your attention to this: At the town of Maple Creek, toward the western boundary of the Province of Saskatchewan, you have the longest growing season to be found anywhere in the Province of Saskatchewan, and the rainfall in the plains that surround that area is on an average from 12 to 15 inches. If you go 35 miles south of Maple Creek you come to the Cypress Hills and those hills only rise a short distance, a few hundred feet above the plain, but the fact that they do rise above the plains forces the warm south winds, laden, sometimes, with moisture, up sufficiently high to cause moisture to fall on those hills; as a result you find trees in the Cypress Hills, measuring 15 inches in diameter, but you find there, as well, that the length of the season in the Cypress Hills is almost exactly the same as the length of the season at Prince Albert which is 250 miles further north.

In other words, if you increase the rainfall of that particular area of country by from five to six inches, you shorten the season sufficiently to sometimes endanger the growing of crops because of the coming of rust and the coming of frost. So, as far as we on the plains are concerned, we are always between two opinions; one, as to whether it is going to rain enough to produce a crop, and the other, as to wether it is going to rain enough to make the crop either rust or freeze.

What I want to say in favour of that part of the country is this: Taking one year with another, ever since people have settled that part of Western Canada, the years in which we get conditions which are more or less ideal for the growing of Number 1 hard wheat, with the highest protein content, probably, of any wheat grown in the world, and therefore sought after by millers throughout the world, that the years in which we get the ideal conditions under which to grow that wheat are vastly greater in number than the years during which we do not obtain those conditions. That is why we are optimistic in Western Canada. That is why we are "next year" people. That is why when we are confronted with poor crop conditions we feel the time is going to come when we are going to have these better crop conditions. Now, I have heard it said in the West by people who have been there for many years and more particularly, by people who were there in the early days and left the West, "Do you recall the Nineties, the years from 1890 to 1895?" and the old timers who are there still, who were pioneers in those days, will tell you they were drier years than those we have been going through now. Others, coming at a later time say, "Do you remember 1907, when the whole crop of Western Canada was frozen, when it stood, looking good, from 30 to 40 bushels to the acre and when the binder was put in it yielded in many cases 15 or 20 of very low grade wheat?" Many have said, "Do you remember 1914, when the average crop for the southwest part of Saskatchewan was in the neighborhood of two bushels to the acre?" Someone else says, "Do you remember the years from 1917 to 1921, when we had a drought almost as great as the one during the years of 1931 to 1934?"

And we who live in the West say this; we say to the man who speaks of the Nineties: To recall the Nineties is to recall the years from 1900 to 1907; to recall 1917 is to recall the years from 1907 to 1914; to recall 1914, with the poorest crop in the history of the Province of Saskatchewan, is to recall 1915, with the best we ever had, and 1916 with a little poorer than that of 1915; to recall 1917 to 1921 is to recall the crops from 1922 to 1928; 1922, with what is known as the drought area today, producing 135 million bushels of wheat; 1928, producing 165 million bushels of wheat, and all the years in between producing good crops.

When we come to this period with those experiences behind us, we say, as we have had our difficult years in the past, we had our good years, and because we had our good years in the past we are going to have our good years again; that is, so far as crop conditions are concerned.

I want to speak to you for a few moments upon Saskatchewan as separated from the other provinces of Western Canada. I have been attempting to give you a picture of the general conditions existing over the West and more particularly on what is known as the third prairie steppe. I want for a few moments to call your attention to this and if you take a sheet of paper and fold it like this (piece of paper folded corner-wise by the speaker to illustrate) you will have a good map of the Province of Saskatchewan with nothing placed on it. That line is the boundary line of the second and third steppes on the great plains of Western Canada, each one of those edges of the steppes parallels the Rocky Mountains. This starts near the boundary line of the United States and the boundary line between Saskatchewan and Manitoba and extends angle-ways across our Province, passing near the City of Regina, passing through the City of Saskatoon, through the City of Battleford and extending up to where the North Saskatchewan comes into the Province of Saskatchewan.

When you are talking about the drought area in the Province of Saskatchewan you are talking about all the area situated south of that line; and when you talk about the area not in the drought area during the present time you are talking of all that part of Saskatchewan which is north of that line. That part of Saskatchewan north of that line is park country; the part south is the prairie country.

I want to tell you a few things about that particular area. We have approximately a million people in Saskatchewan, being the third largest of the provinces in Canada. About half a million are south of that line and about half a million north of it, dividing your city population about equally between the two.

Another thing about it: up in this area north of the line, we have 900,000 head of cattle, or had last fall; down in this area south of the line, 600,000 head of cattle. Up in the north area, there are 400,000 hogs; down in the south area, 200,000 hogs.

But in 1928, we had the best crop we have produced in Saskatchewan in years—321 million bushels, grown in the Province of Saskatchewan. About 100 millions was grown north of that line and the remainder of it was grown south of it.

So you get here somewhat of the picture of Saskatchewan and the importance of wheat growing to this area and to the Dominion of Canada in that area as compared with the importance of wheat to the nothern section of it.

I might say this, that the northern part of the Province of Saskatchewan is more interested in feeding the people who actually live in Saskatchewan and live in other parts of Canada with the products we all require; whereas, this southern part of the province of Saskatchewan is interested almost altogether in the export of wheat and markets for our wheat outside of the Dominion of Canada.

Having pictured that to you, may I say this: That we in Saskatchewan are interested in another fact: This northern area of this province was settled in the years before 1908 and the greater part of it before 1906, the first year in which we had a province. Do you know that we only produced 35 million bushels of wheat in 1926 in the Province of Saskatchewan, with all this northern area settled? The southern area was settled between 1908, when the pre-emption policy was brought in, and 1914, and in 1928, with this area of the province settled, and during the war period, we produced in the Province of Saskatchewan 321 million bushels of wheat, an increase in this northern area of 70 million bushels and an increase in this southern area of 216 million bushels, until Saskatchewan with the opening of that particular area we are discussing when we sometimes think of moving people out of it, with its half million people is producing from that area the greater part of the wheat which is exported from the Dominion of Canada. As a matter of fact, the Province of Saskatchewan, over any period of years you like to take, produces more than half of all the wheat grown in the Dominion of Canada and in the good years, two-thirds of all the wheat grown in Saskatchewan is grown south of that line, and the wheat grown to the south of that line is the wheat which determines the character of our wheat among the peoples of the world where our wheat is to be consumed.

I ask you this question: Do you think it would be good policy to move the people out of that area? Do you think it would be good policy in view of the conditions gone by and the experience we have had to even consider the policy of moving them out? I am sure you will agree with me, it would not be sound policy to follow. If we are going to keep them there we have certain problems that confront us. Some of the problems have to do with production. We have, for example, to study our soil conditions there. It would be obvious to every man here who has had any farming experience that with a rainfall averaging 12 to 18 inches, it is impossible to farm land which has natural drainage underneath in the form of gravel or sand, and no matter what the top six inches of the soil may be like, if the natural drainage is there it is somewhat difficult to continue to grow grain on that kind of land from time to time. Well, the people of Western Canada did not lose sight of that fact. You will remember during the war years there were enormous overages, overages piled up by the old wheat. Some years after the War was over it was decided to turn the monies made from the sale of those overages over to the governments of Western Canada and we, in the Province of Saskatchewan, got the larger proportion of it, because we produced the larger portion of the wheat. We set that money up as a continuous fund and we are using from it, from year to year, the interest from the investment for the purpose of carrying out investigations in connection with matters just like those I am discussing with you now, and the first investigation we undertook was that of soil conditions, and we have mapped out the Province of Saskatchewan on a map actually made up by men who have studied the soil in every part of the Province. We have mapped out the exact soil conditions of the whole settled portions of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some of the men I see before me in this room have seen that map in the City of Regina, and understand what I mean. They will know this: when you look at that map, the spots upon it which should be taken out of agricultural production and general production over the area I speak about, look like postage stamps upon the Province of Saskatchewan. They are very small areas. As you look at it, you conceive it is essential not only for the area itself to take it out of cultivation and put back to grass, but it is essential because of the lands round about it. With our continuous winds we have them, year in and year out, without moisture. Sometimes in the dry years these sands drift to other land in the vicinity and bury thousands of acres round about with six inches to a foot of sand and make the carrying on of agriculture somewhat difficult.

So, our objective in taking the land out of cultivation would be for the purpose of protecting the land round about, rather than to do anything to make the lands themselves useful for agricultural purposes in that section of Canada. That soil survey has been going on.

There is another thing I want to say a word or two about: that is the proposal that we should grow trees in that area. I have illustrated by the illustration of the Cypress Hills that trees grow as a result of what nature does wherever there is any opportunity to grow. All you have to do is put a little more moisture on the soil and the trees will grow. They have grown on the Cypress Hills and on every height of land on one side or the other, over all that prairie section of Western Canada, depending upon the amount of moisture that has fallen upon it. But every man familiar with Western Canada knows this: that one of the most heart-rending scenes that greets the eye of man, as he drives over southern Saskatchewan, after these four or five years of drought, is to see those groves that the best farmers of southern Saskatchewan have planted in the years of sufficient moisture, have seen them nourished through all that time, have gone out each morning to look upon them with a feeling of pride because of their attainment, and to find them at the end of two, three or four years of drought almost completely destroyed and any man who understands southwestern Saskatchewan will agree with me when I say that it would cost more money to plant trees sufficient to have any effect at all upon the growing of crops or the stopping of drifting, and keep trees growing in Western Canada in sufficient numbers to do that, than it costs the government of Canada to keep the people through, even if they have to feed them, from one of the good crop periods to another.

So far as tree growing is concerned, we encourage it as a matter of improving the conditions around the home, as making windbreaks for the gardens, and in improving the conditions of living for the individual farmer, but in so far as influencing our crop condition is concerned, any expenditure we would make on things of that kind would be vastly greater than any profit we would get as a result of having done it. And, after all, in spite of what you hear sometimes from Western Canada, we still believe profits are necessary. (Applause.)

Then, again, there are some people who say we should be building dams. Well, I see Mr. Dunning at the head table. He served in the government of Saskatchewan for a number of years and I had the privilege of serving along with him for a number of years. He will agree with me when I say this: They have been building dams in the Province of Saskatchewan under government supervision and government assistance since 1882, at least, and I have flown over the whole province of Saskatchewan by aeroplane, and looking down upon it you can see the dams dotted here, there and everywhere and there isn't going to be enough money spent in Saskatchewan during the time the drought lasts in building dams to anything like match the number of dams already built by governments, municipalities and individuals, but none of us have been foolish enough to build those dams to change the climate. We built the dams to water cattle and we will let the Lord look after the climate. There is a good reason for doing that. Men who study statistics know that some of the driest spots in the world, so far as rainfall is concerned, are near the middle of the ocean, and some of the driest spots on land, so far as rainfall is concerned, are bordered on one side by either the Atlantic or the Pacific. I need only mention German West Africa or the southern part of the state of California. There are natural deserts in those areas and they are bounded on one side by the ocean, all of which brings me to this point: If you are going to change the climate by having bodies of water, those bodies of water have to be almost as large as the ocean or at least as large as Lake Superior, and after the wind has crossed over and lapped moisture up, you have to build a range of mountains somewhere in order to take the moisture out again. We do not intend doing those things but we still believe in building dams for the watering of stock and making possible the keeping of live stock over those areas to more or less give the farmer the opportunity of carrying on mixed farming.

I only want to say this with regard to mixed farming: Do you know what our most expensive job has been during the last three or four years, so far as the southern area is concerned? Our most expensive job has been keeping the stock. It hasn't been keeping the people. The keeping of those 600,000 head of cattle and the 200,000 hogs in the southwestern part of Saskatchewan has gone up during the present year in the neighbourhood of eight millions of dollars, put up by governments for the purpose and that is one of the most expensive tasks we have had as a result of our efforts to plant mixed farming in an area naturally given to the growing of wheat.

One other thing I want to say with regard to our activities. We are still encouraging what we know as dry farming. Dry farming only consists in this, that it stores up some of the moisture you get this year in order to assist you in growing a crop next year and do you know, this was discovered in a very simple way in the early days of the development of the West. A certain very eminent farmer whom I could name and you would all know if I named him, discovered there years ago that a little plot of land he happened to dig up and did not put anything in but kept it black all summer, the next year grew twice as much as any other part of the field. He said, "This is an idea. Keeping the land black prevents the evaporation by the growth of plant life upon it. If we get average rain this year we can store up moisture by cultivation, keep the subsoil moisture there and next year with an average rain we can grow twice as much wheat on that field."

That, in a few words is what we call 'dry farming'. We mix a little the idea of strip farming. That is still being encouraged and is one of the things that should be encouraged for the difficulties we have in the West. Do you know why we haven't engaged in it to a great extent in recent years? We, in the West, do what you do in business. When we see an opportunity we try to grasp it and we forget sometimes about the future in grasping the opportunity of the present. Do you know what we did when we saw wheat at $2. a bushel? We said, we will take a chance on the weather and this year we will put in twice as much wheat. When it went to $1.50 a bushel, we said, this may be the last year we will get $1.50 and we will go over the mark again. We kept at that during all the years we had our good crops, and when we came to the year of dry weather we did not then have a first year's reservoir to produce the crop of 1931, and we suffered as a consequence, having the most complete failure we had had since 1914.

Now, I repeat, dry farming we consider to be necessary to the building up of our reserves in so far as moisture is concerned and in our co-operation with other organizations for the purpose of putting seed back in the soil this year we are emphasizing the importance of putting the crop, so far as is possible, on summer fallowed land.

There is one other thing I think I should say to you today and that is the last of the solutions I would put up in so far as we are able to control them within the bounds of our own province. As we look back over the periods I have been speaking of, the periods of the nineties, 1907, 1914, the years 1917 to 1921, these last few years, then again over the good periods, we find here and there, all over Western Canada, little groups of people who learned the lesson in economy which, after all, is more worth while than any other lesson the economists know and I spent two years in university trying to find something about it. What is it? I once heard a gentleman on the train say this with regard to a certain type of economist. Another fellow says, "What is an economist?" He said, "An economist of that kind is a man who has only read one book." What I would say is this: If we are going to read only one book, the best book on economy I know of is the good old Bible. The best illustration that we have of what is necessary for us to do in Western Canada in order to make ourselves successful as agriculturists is the good illustration of Joseph in Egypt. As a result of that over cropping, as a result of our weather conditions we have suffered a plague of winds during the last few years, we have suffered a plague of dust, we have suffered a plague of tree lice, we have suffered a plague of hail, and we have suffered a plague of opinions and I am not so sure that the plague of opinions isn't the worst. Through it all, we have had almost seven years and we are probably coming to the period when we are to consider what we should do in the future in order to prepare for the next time we are bound to have similar weather conditions in Western Canada, and the one solution we have been able to find is the good old solution we have been taught from our childhood up.

Do you know why a Scotchman is cautious? Largely because his ancestors lived in Scotland. Do you know why a Frenchman is vivacious? Largely because his ancestors lived in France. Do you know why an Irishman is what he is? Largely because his ancestors lived in the Emerald Isle. The same thing goes all the way along the line and the one solution for the provinces of Western Canada is the keeping of the people on the land who have had the experience during the last twenty, thirty, forty or fifty years and that is the immediate problem of government; that is the immediate problem of men who have their money invested there. That is the immediate problem of municipalities, the immediate problem of all other institutions that are interested in the devlopment of the human race and I wish to say this: We, as a government have been attempting to do certain things in connection with the solution of that problem. We, in Saskatchewan speak only for Saskatchewan, and we say we have had a great deal of co-operation from the organizations that are interested financially. And I would say this, that in this coming summer, all of us working co-operatively with the weather favourable, should be able to produce sufficient wealth out of Western Canada this year to help, at least, to liquidate much of the debt that has grown up during the years of our development.

In conclusion, I want to discuss one matter, which does not concern us so much in the Province of Saskatchewan as a province, as it concerns us as part of the Dominion of Canada. I said to you, toward the beginning, that this southwestern part of Saskatchewan about which we are concerned when we are talking about our problems depends upon the exportation of its products in order to give prosperity to those people. Do you know, in the three years, 1916 to 1918, inclusive, the people of Saskatchewan produced from the land, $1,180,000,000. worth of new wealth? In the years, 1926-7 and 8, do you know that this same area in the last three years for which we have the record only produced $354,000,000 worth of wheat? Why, the reduction is over $800,000.000.

Well, the most pessimistic man we have in Western Canada, when he is making public speeches, never puts our debt above $6,000,000. Some of them get it that high when they add together the debt of the individuals with the debt of the school districts and the debt of the municipalities and the debt of the government and our proportion of the Federal debt. They tell us we owe $600,000,000., and it can never be paid and that we have to have some new system of economics.

When you look at that $600,000,000 of debt and at the decrease in the value of our farm products of $800,-

000,000. in one three-year period, as compared with another, isn't the answer to it all obvious? If we are prepared to live during the first three years we get good crops and fair prices, together with them, if we are satisfied to live as we have *had* to live during the last three years we can pay all that $600,000,000 worth of debt and have $200,000,000 left to live better with than we have been able to live during the last three or four years.

A country that has possibilities like that is not sitting down and saying, there is no future for us. We are not saying the solution is to move our people out of that area into some other. We don't know any place in the world where a half a million people can go and over a term of years can build homes and give comforts and education to their famliies to better advantage than they can in the southwestern part of the Province of Saskatchewan and I am going to say this to you, in addition; that that area today is in the middle of the development of the first generation of its population. Where did you ever find an agricultural area anywhere else in the world that by the end of its first period of development has in it 4,500 schools and that covering the Province of Saskatchewan? There are over 4,500 rural schools and over 3,000 of them haven't a dollar of debenture debt. I would like to repeat that anywhere else. And you will find 2,200 out of the 4,500, or half of them with the cash they have in hand at the present time could pay off all of their indebtedness. Not only is their debenture debt paid up but they could pay every kind of debt they have.

We are in the middle of a generation that has been spending every cent that came into their pockets through our export trade in order to put telephone lines in and build schools, build railways, develop land, buy machinery, and they were caught right in the middle of the first generation without crops over that vast area. Of course, they are hard up. Of course, they haven't money in their pockets, but one out of every four has a land for which he has a clear title, and the way people who have funds to loan can assist Western Canada more than any other way, to my mind, is to go and search out those school districts, search out the individuals and give the lie to the story that is going over Western Canada today that men who have loaned money in Western Canada are only there today to get it out and keep it out. Put a little back in and I venture to say this to you, that the co-operation you will receive if any of you are here who are in the position to do that, the co-operation which you will receive from government bodies, from individuals throughout Saskatchewan will be the best indication of the type of people we have in that section of Canada.

And, after all, with the good soil, with climate for which we have the record and with the people of the type that have come through the difficulties of the past, we all, by co-operation can build up in that central part of Canada a people who will pay their debt, who will pay their way, who will make themselves more valuable to the Dominion of Canada in the future than they have been in the past. The production of that country will do more to move the wheels of transportation and the wheels of industry than any other one thing I know of in the Dominion of Canada, provided we can find our markets on the other side of the ocean for it. And if I were one of those who believed that markets would never come back I would say, let us do as some people say, let us close the place up, but I am not so pessimistic as that. I believe that markets will come back. I believe it because I think I know human nature. A German will not pay $1.80 a bushel for wheat when he can get it for $1.25 any longer than he has to because he thinks it is in the national interest to do so. A Frenchman is built in the same way. So is an Italian. The day will come in Europe, and I believe from news reports it will be before long, that through the getting together of the people of Europe, a balance of power will be brought about which will say that we are going to have at least one generation of peace. With that one generation of peace in the countries where our natural markets are and a willingness on our part to take in exchange for our products the things we are wearing and using in producing that crop, we will build up a trade which will give to Canada a prosperity of the kind we are all looking for.

I thank you. (Prolonged applause.)

Mr. Dana Porter: Referring to the Bible as a textbook on Economics, perhaps Mr. Gardiner will remember the reference in Ecclesiastes, where the words are used: "In times of prosperity rejoice; in years of famine, consider."

We have seen by your address, Sir, today, that the people of the West during the hard times they have experienced have been thinking about their problems and are in a position to take advantage of the good times which are sure to come.

It is difficult to conceive of a clearer picture of the situation in Saskatchewan than the one you have given us today and on behalf of The Empire Club, I thank you very much, indeed.

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE N.R.A.

An Address by MR. WILLIAM O. SCROGGS

Thursday, March 21, 1935

Mr. Dana Porter: Gentlemen, in these days of insecurity, it is perhaps somewhat of a surprise and even though we do not know what our speaker is going to tell us today, perhaps somewhat of a relief to hear that the New Deal has a foreign policy.

Mr. Scroggs is connected with the Council on Foreign Relations, of New York City. Shortly after the signing of the Treaty of Peace there was established in England the Royal Institute of International Affairs, of which there is a branch in Canada known as the Canadian Institute of International Affairs. At the same time there was established in the United States the Council on Foreign Relations. The functions of these bodies are similar. Their purpose is to enquire into various subjects of international affairs, dispassionately and with the approach of scholarship. The membership is made up of a very great variety of men representing as many different points of view as possible. It is not the object of these societies to influence policy or to come to any official conclusion as to what should be done, but merely to attempt to understand and to find out.

Mr. Scroggs comes to us well versed in the subject about which he intends to speak, The Foreign Policy of the New Deal, and as one of the leading members of this Council, the Council on Foreign Relations, he will not be bringing to you any point of view that is the point of view of that Council, but he will be explaining the situation as he sees it. It is with very great pleasure that I introduce to you, Mr. William O. Scroggs.

Mr. William O. Scroggs: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I am very glad that I was asked to discuss the foreign policy of the New Deal and not the domestic policy, because the foreign policy is very much simpler than the domestic policy. I don't believe there has ever been a time within the memory of living people when our American people on the other side of the border were quite so perplexed as to what it is all about as they are today.

I heard a few days ago of a conversation between three American citizens. The question arose: What past year in our history most resembles the present? One of these gentlemen who was an enthusiastic New Dealer, said, "1776, because that was the year we gained our independence, and now we are gaining it again." Another who was even more enthusiastic said, "No, not 1776, but 1865, because then we had emancipation from slavery and we are being emancipated again." And the third, who was a different political faith, said, "No, Gentlemen, you are both wrong. It is not 1776, it is not 1865, but it is 1492." They said, "Why?" And he said, "Don't you know, we are just like Columbus. Columbus sailed out into the unknown, not knowing where he was going, and when he got there he didn't know where he was and he turned around and came home and he never did know just where he had been."

Well, I don't have to discuss the domestic aspects, but I will just add this to what the other two New Dealers said, "Anyhow, whether Columbus knew what it was all about or not, he really did a swell job." Let us hope the swell job is being done even though we don't exactly understand it.

When Mr. Roosevelt came into office he was regarded as more of an internationalist than was President Hoover. He was elected on a platform calling for lower tariffs and he was generally regarded as being more friendly, for instance, to the League of Nations, than his political opponent, but under the pressure of circumstances the Roosevelt Administration during the first year followed a rather strictly nationalist policy. It had to devote its attention to relieving unemployment, to promoting domestic recovery, to taking care of the banks which were in trouble and also it was pledged to carry out certain economic and social reforms and so we find the tendency of an administration which was expected to take a rather internationalist attitude, taking for a time, a nationalist attitude. This is seen in a good many of the domestic policies which had their repercussions on foreign policy, particularly in the case of our monetary policy, our going off gold, our agricultural adjustment policy, and the N.R.A., but that is all beyond the scope of our discussion today.

In the second year the administration had come to the conclusion that domestic recovery could not be attained by relying wholly on domestic measures and so we find an increasing tendency toward economic collaboration with other countries.

The Administration was faced with something of a dilemma. If they went along the nationalist road it would be necessary to abandon some 50,000 acres of land and redistribute a large part of the population and the social cost was too large, as well as the economic cost, so we find the administration comes to rely more on measures of economic collaboration as a means of promoting recovery.

The best example of that economic collaboration, of course, is seen in the Trade Agreement Act in which you people in Canada are very much interested. We have already negotiated reciprocity treaties with three countries —Cuba, Brazil and Belgium, and negotiations have been initiated with about a dozen other countries. Of course, this is still in the experimental stage.

While we have been coming to rely more and more on international economic collaboration we seem, I think, to be showing a tendency to seek at the same time, a greater degree of political isolation. You see that in the case of the World Court, for instance. The Senate refused to ratify our adherence to the World Court although five Presidents have been urging it, from President Wilson down to President Franklin Roosevelt. It is a rather peculiar thing that our international relations the world over, have been going from bad to worse since the worst of the world depression has been past. So far as we can judge, from comparisons of statistics from various countries, we reached the lowest point in the world depression about the middle of 1932. Since then there has been some improvement nearly everywhere; in some countries, quite a substantial improvement; in the 'gold bloc countries,' not so much improvement as in Great Britain and in Canada and the United States. But international relations have been growing worse as economic conditions have tended to become better and that change from bad to worse has had its effect on the foreign policy of the United States, under the New Deal, and so, while we are leaning in the direction of some kind of collaboration, we are also tending to isolate ourselves more and more from the troubles of the rest of the world. We can't completely do it, of course, but we are trying to reduce the points of friction which may involve the United States in international complications.

The indications of that thing, I think, are unmistakable. We can call them, collectively, I think, in the case of my country, a retreat from Imperialism. We have withdrawn the marines from Nicaragua where they had been since about 1910, and we have withdrawn the marines from Haiti, where we had maintained a kind of military government since 1915; and we have abandoned our protectorate over Cuba which existed since Cuba attained its independence as a result of the Spanish-American War. We have made preparations to withdraw from the Philippines. We plan to withdraw gradually over a period of ten years. Now, we are withdrawing from these outposts because the American people really fear another war somewhere in the world. I don't think they fear it immediately. The American people seem to take very calmly the recent German announcement of plans to rearm but they feel that some time in the not distant future there may be another war and they do not wish to be involved in it if it can be avoided.

That is seen in still other ways. The United States is cultivating now, better relations with Latin America than have existed at any time within my memory. The withdrawal of the marines from Nicaragua and Haiti, the abandonment of the protectorate over Cuba are two instances.

We really began this policy in the Coolidge Administration when Mr. Dwight W. Morrow went to Mexico as the American Ambassador and almost from the day Mr. Morrow arrived in Mexico, our relations with Latin America began to improve. President Roosevelt, in December, 1933, made a restatement of the Munroe Doctrine which was intended to reassure Latin American neighbours. The Munroe Doctrine, as you know, goes back to the year 1823, and it was directed at a group of European powers who had been suspected of designs to restore the rule of Spain in South America. Essentially, the Doctrine is that we shall not tolerate European interference in the affairs of our southern neighbours. The southern neighbours for whose benefit this was intended have never appreciated it and they feel we are trying really to assert a kind hegemony over Latin America, and in the course of time the Munroe Doctrine was elaborated by several Presidents, until under President Theodore Roosevelt we had practically taken the position, since we were not allowing European nations to interfere in Latin American affairs if any trouble developed in Latin America, then it was up to us to perform the duties of the peace office and preserve peace.

Well, President Roosevelt has restated the Doctrine and gone back to the first principle. In a speech which he delivered in December, 1933, he said, "It is not the sacred obligations of the United States to maintain constitutional government in nearby countries. That is the duty, first of all, of the country immediately concerned, and it is only when these disturbances begin to affect other countries that it is the duty of other countries to take some action," and he pledged that the United States would, before taking any action, also consult with the neighbours of the country concerned and he has carried that out on a number of occasions. When revolution broke out in Cuba in the summer of 1933, President Roosevelt summoned representatives of some half dozen Latin American countries to the White House and consulted with them about policy and as you know, we went through that revolution without the United States intervening although the United States had the legal right at that time under our treaties with Cuba to intervene whenever there were disorders that were threatening life and liberty and civil order in the country. We landed no marines. We recognized the first government which showed that it rested on the consent of a considerable part of the Cuban people and then we went further and repealed what is known as the Platt Amendment which is the legislative enactment which establishes the wayside protection over Cuba. Under the Platt Amendment, Cuba could not make any treaties with foreign countries involving anything like an alliance, and Cuba could not incur foreign indebtedness on its own responsibility, and Cuba acknowledged the right of the United States, also, to intervene when it seemed the existing government couldn't maintain law and order. Our abrogation of the Platt Amendment has done a great deal to improve our relations not merely with Cuba but with all the Latin American countries. So, that policy we call 'the good neighbour policy'.

Now, just a word with regard to our relations with Europe. A great many people think, a great many Canadians think the foreign policy of the United States is characterized by isolation. But we have never followed a policy of isolation in the Far East. We have always been ready to take a hand in affairs there when we thought it necessary. We have never followed a policy of isolation in Latin America. It is only in the case of Europe that our policy smacks at all of isolation. The Roosevelt Administration has carried on President Hoover's policy so far as disarmament is concerned and has gone a little further in the direction of making what they regard as practical arrangements for disarmament than the Hoover Administration was willing to go.

The United States is not a member of the League of Nations but has been represented in the Disarmament Conference called under League auspices and when the Disarmament Conference first met, the United States proposed what it called 'qualitative disarmament'; that is, let the nations lay aside their offensive armaments and maintain defensive armaments only. France, you will recall, was demanding that she should have guarantees of security before there was a treaty for disarmament. The Hoover Administration hoped, by advocating qualitative disarmament and the abandonment of offensive armaments that they would meet the French demand for security; that is that the great powers would abandon certain weapons which allegedly could be used for offensive warfare and they could increase if they cared to, their defensive weapons. In other words, they could build as many forts along their frontiers as they pleased but they ought to agree among themselves not to build heavy mobile artillery, that they should abandon tanks, bombing planes and chemical warfare.

Well, it is very difficult when we come to concrete cases to draw the line between offensive and defensive weapons. If some one trespasses on your place and is brandishing a brick bat or a sword at you, that brick bat is an offensive weapon, but if the brick bat is in your hands and you are trying to drive off the invader, the brick bat is a defensive weapon, so when an attempt is made to put into rigid category an offensive and defensive weapon, it was decided it could not be done and a British delegate finally said he had come to the conclusion that armaments are defensive when you are standing behind them and offensive when you are standing in front of them, so the whole effort to solve the disarmament problem on the ground of offensive and defensive armaments is practically abandoned.

Now, President Roosevelt, shortly after taking office, in an address to the fifty-three nations which were represented in the Disarmament Conference, urged a new international treaty, a non-aggression treaty. The importance of that non-aggression treaty is that it was to carry a simple definition of aggression. The nations were to pledge themselves mutually, not to send armed forces of any character across their own frontiers, and a nation which did that would be adjudged the aggressor. Now, that Non-Aggression Treaty goes much further than the Briand-Kellogg Pact. Under the Briand-Kellogg Pact, some fifty odd nations, as you know, have renounced war as an instrument of national policy. But we have discovered that in the Far East and down in South America, several countries have been able to carry on really first class wars in spite of their agreement in the Kellogg-Pact, simply because they don't call it war. They have never formally declared war and they go on fighting. Now, instead of leaving that loophole, the Non-Aggression Pact would stipulate that the country which sent its forces across its frontiers is an aggressor and a violator of the treaty, but the administration has not stopped at that. It has announced its willingness in a case of a disarmament treaty and agreement through this Non-Aggression Pact to consult with the other nations whenever there is any threat to world peace.

Now, the agreement to consult is really important. Lord Grey said if there had been a general agreement among the world powers to consult in 1914, that the World War would not have come in 1914. We are willing then to consult if there is a threat to world peace, but we will go further than that, if in the course of this consultation, the other countries agree on who is the aggressor, and the United States concurs in that agreement, then the United States will not promise to join others in punishing the aggressor, but it will promise not to insist on its rights as a neutral in case war does come.

Now, that is a very important concession. In 1914, when war broke out between Germany and the Allied Powers, the United States was a neutral and as a neutral insisted on the right to trade with belligerents on both sides; but if they should carry through these proposals which have been made from Washington, if a war should break out, and we should consult with the other nations and all those in consultation, including ourselves should agree on who is the aggressor, then we would notify American citizens that if they attempted to trade with the aggressor country they do so at their own risk and peril and will have no claim for protection of damages from the United States Government. (Applause).

That arrangement, of course, is dependent upon the nations first getting together and agreeing to disarm; to some extent to accept a general disarmament treaty, perhaps somewhat along the lines the British have suggested at Geneva.

Then, in connection with Disarmament, we have the problem of naval disarmament. That is really a problem between the three great naval powers, Great Britain, the United States and Japan. In 1922 a treaty was signed at Washington under which Great Britain, Japan and the United States agreed to a naval ration of five, five, three, which means Japan is to have naval tonnage forty per cent below that of Great Britain and the United States. Linked with that treaty were two other treaties which made certain political arrangements in the Pacific and perhaps if these political arrangements hadn't been made it would have been impossible to reach an agreement to restrict naval tonnage. One of the other treaties is called "The Four Power Treaty," the treaty within the powers that have possessions in the Pacific, Great Britain, the United States, Japan and France. These four powers agreed to respect each others possessions and they agreed to consult among themselves in case there is any aggression upon their possessions.

Then, there is the Nine Power Treaty in which five other nations besides the four I have named are joined, in which these various countries have agreed to respect the territorial integrity of China and to maintain the open door.

Now, the Naval Agreement and the Nine Power Agreement are all tied together in one system to maintain stability and peace in the Pacific, but Japan lately has insisted that the Naval Agreement must be altered. Japan insists on complete naval equality with Great Britain and the United States and in December there was a preliminary conference in London in which the United States and Great Britain and Japan took part in an effort to work out some satisfactory arrangement. That failed and on the 29th of December last, Japan gave formal notice of her intention to abrogate the Naval Treaty. She has to give notice two years in advance which means unless some arrangement is reached before the end of 1936, that the five, five, three ratio arranged will be at an end.

Now, the United States has taken the position that Japan is entitled in the Pacific to naval equality. That is not to tonnage equality but to equality of security—equality of security but not equality of tonnage. And the United States Government has maintained that the five, five, three ratio gives Japan equality of security because Great Britain and the United States have interests both in the Atlantic and in the Pacific and therefore they need a larger naval establishment than Japan. To give Japan naval equality in tonnage means giving Japan naval superiority in the Pacific and that, neither Great Britain or the United States is willing to concede. So there will probably be a new kind of naval conference sometime during the current year in an effort to work out a solution. The solution reached in 1922, as I said, was really more of a political solution than a technical naval solution and that very same arrangement which was made in 1922 was due in considerable measure to the influence of the Canadian Government. That has only begun to be recognized. During the current month I have seen three magazine articles pointing out the good work which Canada did in preparation for the Washington Naval Conference in 1922, and of course Canada has a great interest in that because Canada has a Pacific coast as well as an Atlantic. Canada is next door neighbour to the United States and is attached in all kinds of ways to Great Britain and Canada has been instrumental, according to the authorities who have been discussing it, in keeping Great Britain and the United States together on a Pacific policy.

If a new agreement with Japan is reached on this naval question it will probably be linked as it was in 1922 with some new political arrangement and some students of political problems are saying that perhaps as we are planning to get out of the Philippines we can make certain concessions; that is, get a joint agreement between the naval powers for the neutralization of the Philippines, and that may in a way, meet part of the Japanese demands, but of course that is only surmise and we must wait and see.

So much for relations in general with the Far East and with our European and our southern neighbours.

Now, as I said a moment ago, our foreign policy in general is not quite one of isolation although many people in the United States still think it is and still insist it is. If you look back to 1920, at all the international agreements that have been worked out since 1920, you will find the United States has played a prominent part in a great many of them. The names of a great many of these agreements show the part which the United States has played. I mention the Washington Naval Treaty—that was in 1922. In 1924, we had the Dawes Plan and in

1928, we have the Kellogg Pact, and in 1929, the Young Plan and in 1931, the Hoover Moratorium, and in 1932, the so-called Stimson Doctrine, by Secretary of State Stimson, which has been adopted by the League of Nations and which pledges the members of the League not to recognize the fruits of military aggression, which has prevented the members of the League from recognizing what Japan has done in Manchuria.

Just a word as to how far you can count upon the United States in going to promote collective security and the stabilization of peace. There are a number of things which very definitely the United States will not do. The United States will not agree to allow any outside agency to determine what its policy shall be under a given situation which may arise in the future. The United States will not even say today what it will do in a future contingency. It does insist on freedom to form its own independent judgment and to act as it seems its interests dictate when it meets that situation. The United States is willing to stand with its agreement with other nations not to recognize the fruits of aggressive warfare. That is, it will co-operate with other nations in maintaining the Stimson Doctrine. The United States is ready to join other nations in a treaty for disarmament or, more correctly, for arms limitation, more than actual disarmament. The United States announced its readiness to join other nations in a non-aggression pact and the United States is ready to consult with other nations in the event they agree to a limitation of armaments, to consult with other nations and to modify its policy of neutrality if it agrees with the other nations as a result of this consultation. That is as far as you can safely count on the United States going in the promotion of collective security but that is, I think, really a substantial distance and I would say further, that the history of the United States since 1920 has shown that there is a vast difference between what we actually do when an occasion arises and between what we say we will do in advance. That is, we will not promise before a trouble arises that we will do a certain thing in the case of trouble but when trouble comes we frequently do certain things we would never think of promising we would do before hand.

The New Deal moved toward nationalism in its first year; in its second year it has moved toward international collaboration. It may, under the pressure of development, have to modify its policy again, but whatever it does, I rather think that perhaps Canada will have considerable influence in its policy. I think the man who is, perhaps, our greatest internationalist, is Professor Shotwell of Columbia University. He is really the author of the Briand-Kellogg Pact, the Pact of Paris, and he is a native of Canada. On the other hand, our greatest anti-internationalist is probably Father Coughlin—he also is a native of Canada. So, I say, no matter which way we go, one way or the other, Canada perhaps, will have a finger in the pie. (Applause, prolonged.)

THE NEWSPRINT RIDDLE

AN ADDRESS BY CHARLES A. M. VINING, A.M.B.A.

Thursday, March 28, 1935

MR. DANA PORTER: Before introducing the speaker today, I wish to mention that we have at my left, Mr. Malcolm Morley, who is in this country to judge at the Drama Festival. On behalf of the Club, I wish to welcome Mr. Morley. (Applause.)

In Pickwick Papers we read about a certain barrister who was described as a promising young man of about forty. Our guest today, Mr. Vining, is less than forty, but he could hardly be called a promising young man because he already has very great and notable achievements behind him. We were, perhaps, first introduced to Mr. Vining in the days when he wrote for some of the more frivolous journals of this city. Gradually he became more and more serious until he has now taken up his pen to portray the statesmen of this country.

Mr. Vining, from the very outset of his career showed that combination of the accuracy of the scholar and the imagination of the journalist. Consequently, he has now arrived in a position which might be called a position of big busines. In the recent book he has written, "Bigwigs," he has shown that penetration, wit and that great resistance to pomposity which he has shown from the early days when he wrote for "The Goblin" in Toronto. But, if I praise Mr. Vining too highly, he will want to debunk me so I call upon Mr. Vining who is known to you through his writings and is known to you as the President of the Newsprint Export Manufacturers Association of Canada, to discuss the question of "The Newsprint Riddle". Mr. Vining.

MR. CHARLES A. M VINING: Mr. President and Members of The Empire Club: Being a minister's son, I have never been allowed to stay long enough in one place to have a real home town. If I could claim a home town, however, I think it would be Toronto. Moreover, I find beside me in the person of your President, an old friend of my school days in Toronto, and I am sure, therefore, you will believe me when I say I especially appreciate your kindness in asking me here today and that I am genuinely happy to be at this table. I often think of those school days in Toronto and reflect upon the mystery of man's fate. Your President and I used to sit in the same lecture room, absorb the same economics, the same Roman Law. He was industrious and so, I think, was I. But see what has happened. He left Varsity and went onward and upward to Osgoode Hall. He achieved his call to the Bar; he climbed even higher and became a partner in his eminent firm. Now, he is President of the Empire Club, the highest distinction, I understand, Toronto can offer its citizens. I left Varsity and did not go to Osgoode. No, I took my first downward step and became a newspaper reporter. My descent quickened and I slipped into the advertising business. Now, any Toronto audience will judge the completeness of my degredation when I confess I live in Montreal and am connected with the newsprint industry.

The newsprint industry is the subject I am now going to talk about. We could, perhaps, have a more pleasant subject but we could have very few subjects of more real importance to every person in this room. Newsprint, next to wheat, is the chief commodiy we have for sale to the world. Newsprint, next to agriculture is our largest manufacturing industry. Newsprint means the livelihood of many thousands of our people and affects the welfare of us all and few Canadians know anything about it.

I doubt if we realize that in the last five years of depression the newsprint industry, in spite of its disruption, has brought to this country, from foreign customers, $472,000,000., compared with $360,000,000 of gold production and $95,000,000. of nickel exports. I doubt if we realize that production of newsprint this year means the employment of 75,000 men in our woods, another 25,000 or so in the mills and many thousands more in related industry. I doubt if we realize that the 500 to 700 million dollars which we have invested in this industry is our largest industrial investment, with the exception of our investment in Hydro-electric power, and newsprint, by the way, consumes almost half of our total power development; and still more do I doubt whether many realize that the forests upon which the newsprint industry is based and which it is consuming in vast quantities each day, belongs chiefly to the people of Canada, that the public is the real landlord of this property which governments have leased to the industry on your behalf. In short, you and I and our neighbours, have in newsprint, a close proprietory interest and its is surprising that we have not realized it more clearly. It is also unfortunate, because as I think you will agree a little later, we badly need in this country today a force of public opinion to check the destruction of this great industry, the depletion without profit of one of our chief sources of national wealth.

I am going to give you, therefore, as well as I can, a brief account of the newsprint industry, the course it has followed, the consequences of that course and some conclusions we may be able to draw from it. Before I finish, you may appreciate why I have described this subject as 'The Newsprint Riddle'.

Before I proceed, however, it may be well if I explain just what newsprint is for I find many people who do not know. Newsprint is paper, paper on which newspapers are printed. It is a world commodity, as universally used today as coal or steel or cotton or salt, and Canada has become its chief producer. Newsprint is made from trees, from spruce and balsam. Men cut these trees in our northern woods and each spring drive them down our rivers to the pulp and paper mills which dot Northern Ontario and Quebec, and, to a less extent, the Maritimes, British Columbia and Manitoba. At the mills, the logs are ground into a fine pulp and mixed with a proportion of chemically treated pulp and the wet pulp which is like thin porridge, is fed into huge machines and emerges at the other end in rolls of newsprint. These rolls are shipped to all parts of the continent and across the seas to England, Australia, South America and the Orient. They feed the presses of the world and this is the material you handle when you read your newspaper unless, of course, you happen to read one Toronto publication which, I understand, is by necessity printed upon asbestos. (Laughter.)

Well, now, let us see the record of this industry, the course it has followed and the consequences of that course and I am afraid I must warn you that this story of newsprint is a story of our own folly. Ten years ago in 1925, the newsprint industry was sound, healthy and flourishing. It had six years or so of remarkable growth due to increasing consumption of newsprint in the United States, but its growth had been sound, keeping proper pace with demand. From very small proportions the industry had grown to a capacity of 1,720,000 tons a year.

The damage began in 1926. It was operating by the way, at about ninety per cent of that capacity. This prosperity of the industry was too much for us, for all of us, manufacturers, financial interests, governments and investors, alike. In the six years between 1925 and 1931, the rate of expansion of the industry was almost treble that of the preceding six years. The industry's capacity, (that is, its production capacity) increased from 1,720,000 tons in 1925 to 3,600,000 tons in 1931, which is about our present annual capacity. This expansion far outstripped consumption although consumption climbed steadily for several years and has been very well maintained through the depression. The newsprint industry has never suffered from diminished demand as other industries have suffered. Last year, for example, our total consumption was within five per cent of the all time peak of 1929, a condition of good fortune which, I think, is true of very few industries and one which demonstrates the basic soundness of this industry.

In spite of this excellent consumption record and in spite of this recovery, we still have today an excess capacity of more than 1,200,000 tons a year. That is, the industry is equipped to make more than 1,200,000 tons over anything it has been able to sell. The danger of excess capacity to an industry, is, of course, the extreme condition which it creates and in the case of newsprint, this danger has been accentuated by the importance which the industry as a whole has attached to tonnage rather than to dollars.

There are some twenty companies or more in the industry and most of them have been obsessed with the determination to obtain or at least to retain tonnage, regardless of the position of other companies and in many cases, regardless of the price. Taking human nature into account, this is an understandable policy but it has proven a very costly one for all concerned, for it has led to repeated price cutting and to such a wide difference in the position of different companies that there has been no chance whatever of stability. Last year, the industry, as a whole, operated at 67 per cent capacity—a very good average, indeed, compared with other industry, but while the average was 67 per cent, we had and still have, some long companies with their mills filled from 85 to 100 per cent of their capacity and some short companies operating at only 40 to 50 per cent. In this different proportion of business we have all the elements of continued trouble.

Another source of trouble peculiar to the newsprint industry, is its method of making contracts and I should like to take a minute to explain this cause in its profound effect upon newsprint fortunes—it is of extreme importance. The industry's method of making contracts, based on the theory which most publishers insist upon, that all companies shall sell at the same price, or to put it another way, that no publisher shall be able to buy newsprint at less than another, to apply this theory it established the practice that a company makes its contract price dependent upon the contract of another company or companies. As a result, a single contract by one company could so affect the contract of other companies as to set the price for the whole industry, and price is usually named for a period of a year. One price cutting newsprint salesman who may be interested chiefly in the commission he receives, can determine the fate of this great industry for a whole year and cost the industry and this country millions of dollars.

Well, with this condition of excess capacity, this competitive obsession for tonnage among twenty companies or more, and this very dangerous method of making contracts, it is not difficult, I am sure, for you to see the highly vulnerable position which the newsprint industry has occupied.

Let us now see the consequences: In 1926 and 1927, the price of newsprint for delivery in New York was $70. a ton. In 1928 it was $67.50; in 1929 and 1930, it held at $62.00. Then the real drop began. In little more than two years the price of newsprint dropped $22.00 a ton, from $62.00 at the end of 1930, to $40.00 in April, 1933. The market price is still at that $40.00 level and has remained at the $40.00 level for the last two years in spite of sharp improvement in consumption. Consumption last year, for example, was higher than in 1930, but the net price was 40 per cent lower. We are still today at this $40.00 level. There was hope last fall of a moderate increase for 1935, but this hope was destroyed by the action of one company which made 1935 contracts at the $40.00 price in order to obtain some new tonnage—a striking example of the dangerous contract method which I have described. The $40.00 price is the lowest figure since 1908, and I think I am right in saying that relatively it is almost the lowest of all world commodity prices today.

The commodity price index issued by our Dominion Bureau of Statistics shows the following typical prices of commodities in January 1935, compared in each case with 100 in 1926: Cement, 105.2—and, by the way, cement operated in 1934 at 30 per cent of capacity whereas newsprint operated in 1934 at 67 per cent—coal, 91.6; sugar, 83.9; pig iron, 83; cotton, 73.2; flour, 70.6; newsprint, 54.

If you will consider the effect of this price decline for a minute, I am sure you will agree it is time we began to measure the newsprint industry in terms of dollars as well as in tons. In 1929, the industry sold 2,700,000 tons of newsprint and contributed to our national income, from foreign sources, nearly 150 million dollars. Last year, we sold, the industry sold practically the same amount of tonnage but contributed 70 million dollars less. In 1932 which probably, or we shall hope was the bottom of the depression, newsprint sales reached their lowest point with a total of slightly less than 2 million tons. Last year, our sales totalled 35 per cent above that point but our total dollars were 3 millions less.

That is one effect of the price decline from a national point of view.

Another effect is in forest depletion. With this low price and with more than fifty per cent of this industry in receivorship or its equivalent, the natural tendency and the necessary tendency of each company is to use its best wood, with no provision being made for replacement, and which uses up our timber lands at a prodigious rate. The daily newspapers of New York and Chicago alone, in one day, consume 480 acres of timber land. The 2,600,000 tons of newsprint we sold last year represented consumption of over 1,000 square miles of our forests, an area more than a hundred miles long by ten miles wide. At this rate of consumption and with no provision for replacement, it will not be many years before the Canadina industry is incapable of making low cost newsprint whether it wishes to or not.

This is a problem for the publisher as well as the manufacturer to ponder upon. In the meantime we are consuming our forests and we are obtaining virtually no return upon the hundreds of millions of real money invested in this industry.

To illustrate the position of the newsprint investor today, let me read you another index from the Bureau of Statistics. This shows the market standing of common stocks of various industries in February, 1935, compared again with 100 in 1926: Oils, 177.5; Foods, 135.9; Iron and Steel, 124.5; Gold Mines, 119.4; Textiles, 74.2; Newsprint, 12.8.

So there we have our account of the newsprint industry, its over-expansion and resultant excess capacity, its competitive obsession for tonnage with longs in a raid against shorts, its dangerous methods of making contracts, the consequences of all these things expressed in the present ruinous price and its effects, and we have spoken of the national importance of this industry and its basic soundness.

Looking at these two sides of the story you may well feel it is about time we had a solution to end the folly of the last few years.

I heard it said that if all the economists in the world were laid end to end they would never reach a conclusion. Perhaps that is true of those who have been wrestling with the riddle of newsprint. Let us look at the riddle anyway and see if there are any conclusions which we can form and as a starting point, let us consider briefly the attempts which have already been made.

There have been three organized attempts at solution. These occurred between 1927 and 1933, and each of them lasted about two years. They were the Canadian Newsprint Company, the Newsprint Institute and the Bankers

Committee. They involved not only the manufactures, but our three largest banks and the governments of Ontario and Quebec. I shall not go into the details of these although each of them is an interesting story. I think I may summarize them by saying these attempts were as follows:

First, to set up a central sales agency or central sales company for all the principal producers. Second, to pool all contracts and divide tonnage among companies according to their capacity. Third, to consolidate the industry by bringing twenty or so companies into a small number of strong groups. These attempts all failed and to speak in general terms, I think it is accurate to say that they failed for the following four reasons: In the first place, there have always been among the industry, of twenty or more companies, as there must in an industry of this size, one or two or three companies unwilling to engage in any co-operative action. In the second place, there have always been one or two or more companies who have ostensibly engaged in co-operation but whose statements have been untruthful, whose undertakings have been broken and who, to put it plainly, have dealt dishonestly with the rest of the industry. In the third place there has never been a real willingness on the part of long companies as a whole to accept a lower tonnage position in order to obtain stability. The long companies have failed to realize that their extra tonnage might be not an advantage but a source of danger and such division as to tonnage as there has been has been inadequate and too long delayed. And, in the fourth place, there has never been any effective means of compelling recalcitrant companies to participate in or adhere to co-operative action. Companies which have kept their undertakings have suffered thereby, while those who have cheated have gained an unfair advantage, temporarily, at least. Mutual confidence between members of the industry has thus been steadily destroyed. In justice to the industry, I think I must say that the moral standard is probably no worse than that of any other industry. The majority of our newsprint companies today are represented by men who are honourable and intelligent but you must bear in mind the dangerous contract method which I have described and by which one company can upset the best intentions of the rest.

I think the causes of failure may be very briefly described by saying that there has always been in this industry a destructive minority and there has never been a means of contolling them. There has been no organized attempt at solution since the Bankers Committee ceased its activities about the end of 1932.

The next hope of the industry developed, not in Canada, but in the United States when the National Industrial Recovery Act became law in June, 1933. For twelve months or so after that there was hope that an effective N.R.A. code might be applied to the neswprint industry in the United States and that this might also apply to Canadian producers. But the opposition of the American Newspaper Publishers Association was too powerful. The hope was not realized and the industry approached another annual contracting period last September with no solution in sight.

It was, however, obvious to anyone interested in the industry last fall that the price should be advanced and most manufacturers seemed to regard $5.00 a ton as a proper figure. The attempt which was made to secure this was based on voluntary and unorganized co-operation between manufacturers having similar policies. The increase was blocked by the action of one company—in the first instance, by one company—in the manner I have described. Later, an attempt was made to negotiate an increase of only $20.50 a ton, but this also was unsuccessful. The price in 1935 thus remains at the $40.00 level in spite of increasing consumption and in spite of increasing cost of production, which to face the unpleasant truth, leaves this industry in a worse position today than it was a year ago.

From the experience which these unsuccessful efforts of the last seven years provide, I think there are one or two conclusions we may form: As number 1 conclusion, I think it is obvious that the primary weakness of the industry has always been and still is, its excess capacity and that there is little use in attempting to deal with the price of newsprint or other deficiencies until a sound way has been found to deal with the instability which excess capacity creates.

I must digress for a moment at this point, to make it quite clear I have never believed and do not now believe that the industry's remedy lies in a high price or in repeated price increases. My belief is to the contrary. I think it is apparent that the price is uneconomic and ultimately dangerous to publisher as well as manufacturer and that some degree of increase is necessary, but I believe the increase should be moderate and I believe the long term policy of this industry should be to sell at the lowest possible price, consistent with proper provision for forest depletion, fair wages to labour, and a reasonable return upon actual investment. We must think of newsprint as a world commodity in a world market and we must accept efficient management, minimum price and fair dealing as our only sound formula. I believe this view is now held by so large a proportion of the industry that no customer of the industry need fear any different policy.

As conclusion number 2, I think it is sensible to realize that co-operation without compulsion offers no hope of a dependable solution. Some form of co-operation may serve as a temporary expedient but its success now would probably depend on whether or not the industry had before it a plan of a more permanent nature. When we think of compulsion, it is natural, of course, to think of governmental action. It should be recognized although it is difficult for everybody to recognize, that our governments have a right which might become a duty to restrain this industry from continued self destruction in view of the fact it is public property, your property, which is involved. Control by legislation, however, is a desperate and a doubtful remedy and one to which the majority of the industry is undoubtedly opposed. We shall be on far safer ground if we determine to find a solution along sound business and financial lines, supplemented, perhaps, by a helpful governmental attitude but still a business solution rather than a governmental one.

If we are to seek a business solution, I think our conclusion number 3 must be that consolidation still appears to be the only permanent remedy for this industry. We might perhaps find a preliminary to consolidation in some form of co-operative or joint acquisition of excess mills, but I think one is forced to the conclusion that consolidation is the true ultimate answer. By consolidation I mean the regrouping of the industry into three or four strong companies—not to form a monopoly but to retain the stimulus of competition, to secure a sound businesslike way of managing excess capacity, and to permit the most economic and efficient operation of this industry which must, of course, be our main objective. I think there can be little doubt as to the desirability of consolidation, either from the customer' point of view or the manufacturers' point of view. The real problem of consolidation is how to bring it about. It is doubtful if the industry can accomplish it and it would appear that some outside driving force is necessary.

We are left then with these two questions: First, how can consolidation be accomplished? Second, what can be done in the meantime to deal with the weaknesses we have seen in this industry?

The first is the more important question; the second; the more pressing, and to either of them today I offer no immediate answer. I do, however, offer this suggestion: You who constitute the public and are the real proprietors of this industry can play a very important part by the force of your opinion in supplying the missing element of compulsion, the element which has been missing in the attempts of the last seven years. I firmly believe that a well informed public actively concerned in what is happening to one of our chief national assets can do a great deal to discourage further misconduct by those who should regard themselves as trustees. That is one reason, Mr. President, why I have greatly appreciated this opportunity to be here today and why I thank you sincerely for listening to me at such length. (Applause, prolonged.)

MR. FETHERSTONAUGH: May I say a word from the floor? I think this address today is the most practical address The Empire Club has listened to for many a long day. (Applause.) I think it brings before us an industry which I know at least, so far as I am concerned, a great many of us know has not been understood at all—the great importance of it, and I think also that the speaker is to be congratulated for his most practical summary of the situation. If all other industries—if you could get such a light on other industries of this country, I am certain there would be a good deal more done in bringing back prosperity. (Applause.)

MUNITIONS AND COMMON SENSE

AN ADDRESS BY MAJOR L. A. CODD

Thursday, April 4, 1935

MR. DANA PORTER: Today, Gentlemen, we are considering a subject which has been very much before the public of this country and the United States in recent years.

The late President of the United States, Mr. Calvin Coolidge once attended a sermon—and perhaps he attended a sermon more than once. On one occasion, having attended a sermon he came home and his wife asked what the sermon was about. Mr. Coolidge being a man of few words, eventually said, "Sin". His wife being very curious when this subject was mentioned wanted to know what the minister had said about sin, and finally, with great reluctance, Mr. Coolidge said, "He was against it."

We have heard one aspect of the armament problem, that aspect of it that has been presented to the Club has been universally against munitions.

Today, Major Codd of the Army Ordnance Association of Washington proposes to speak on a somewhat different aspect of the problem. He is not connected with any private interest in this industry. The Association is a purely voluntary association, but he believes as other people associated with him do, that there is another side to the question which should be fairly presented to the public. It is therefore, with the great pleasure that I bring Major Codd to this Club, and I may remind you that this Club does not further any particular view on any particular subject. Our attempt is to have as many and as great a variety of views presented as possible. Major Codd.

MAJOR L. A. CODD: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada: I need not tell you, I hope, how delighted I am at the opportunity you have given me to address you this afternoon, and I trust that I need not assure you I am grateful for the honour, not only of being here with this distinguished organization, but also for the many courtesies and kindnesses which the officials of your group and particularly Mr. Porter have shown me. I feel that an after luncheon speaker should reciprocate as best he may and the only thing I can do, by way of reciprocation is to get on with my subject.

I am reminded of a story which makes the rounds in the United States army, about a certain Colonel who was far from a good horseman. One day there was a regimental review and of course the Colonel had to be mounted and all of his organization were curious among themselves as to what would happen when the Colonel was astride his mount. When the military band came by the mount began to prance and to canter and the men were so intent on watching the Colonel that one company in particular broke its line quite unheedingly and when the Captain saw his men in that form, he hurriedly came up and gave the command, "Ease off." Whereupon, one of the men in the ranks said, "No, he ain't off, but he soon will be." So, probably the sooner I am off or on, as the case may be, the better.

Now, I want to speak to you very, very frankly about this subject that I am here to discuss this afternoon. In my desire to be as frank as I can, I shall have, at the start, to speak a little in the first person. I want to tell you that I am not a spokesman for any individual or any company in the United States or elsewhere, nor was I ever engaged in the manufacture of armaments. I am not an employee of any such company. I am not a stockholder in any such company and I say that to emphasize the fact that my view is not at all the view of a party in interest. I hope it is not necessary for me to tell you that I am not a militarist or a war monger. I share as definitely and heartily and sincerely the views of every sane individual in his detestation of war. I do share the policy of my native country, of a degree of adequate preparedness but there is a sharp distinction between preparedness against war and any effort or inclination to wage it or to foment it.

With those negative explanations, may I add just one or two of a positive nature? As your President has already indicated to you, I am the Executive Secretary of the Army Ordnance Association with headquarters in Washington, and I am Managing Editor of Army Ordnance, its by-monthly publication. The organization has been in existence now fifteen years and grew entirely out of our world war experience. I am not here to further the interests of that Association, but I should tell that it is not a group of munitions makers, but rather of engineers and manufacturers of the United States, several thousand of them who, by reason of their experiences during the World War, believe that the cultivation on their part of a knowledge of the design, manufacture and engineering technique of munitions production is one of the most important phases of our national defence. The Association is not organized for profit. It has no commercial interests, no political affiliation, no religious connection. It may be said to be intensely patriotic in so far as it endeavours to hold itself and its members in reserve, should the industrial strength of the United States ever again be required in any phase of a major emergency.

With these explanations out of the way, may I add a few philosophical, if you will, reflections in connection with this general subject, "Munitions and Common Sense." You know there is a great deal of misunderstanding today of that very term, munitions. If you will consult any recognized authority you will find that munitions, as a term is all inclusive. It embraces everything. Let's take the definition given in Webster's Dictionary:

It embraces everything used by a defence force in time of war. And it is literally understood to mean that among military men. The munitions of an army means the supplies of that army, with everything that it requires in the completion of its objective. Munitions is so all-embracive, so inclusive a term, that it includes everything from shoes and socks and tooth brushes, which an army uses, to tanks and aeroplanes and guns—everything from army pants to navy beans, and supplies in time of war for an army is oftentimes more acute than man power.

If there is one lesson that was proved to the United States it was that we could mobilize men at a much faster rate than we could begin to supply them with the things they would need for their own protection in battle. Supplies are all important in varying degree.

I am reminded of a story that is told about the tribes in China where a General was captured by one of the factions. Emissaries were sent over to see if they could not arrange his release. So the emissaries thought they would trade a little bit with the captors. The captors were willing to consider the trade and said, "Well, what have you to offer for the General we now have?" They said, "Well, we will give you four Lieutenant-Colonels for him." The Chinaman shook his head, "No, he wouldn't do that." "Well, then, we will give you eight Majors." "No, we won't do that." "We will put those two together and give you a couple of captains." "No, that won't do."

"What can we give you." The captors said, "We can't think of releasing your General for anything less than 24 cans of condensed milk."

"Now, armament is a term and the military armaments I speak of is just one particular part of this whole munitions question and when we hear a great deal of complaint raised these days about munitions makers, the complaints certainly mean the armament makers because if they use the broad term, then they must include everybody who makes anything that an army can use. So, when I speak and use the word munitions, I certainly mean it in the sense of armaments.

May I give just another reflection? It is the great misunderstanding that exists generally today about the effect of modern armaments upon war. If I read history correctly, I can not see how a common sense viewpoint of the question can claim that armaments are a prime cause of war. Rather, it is most convincing from the record of history, to me at least, that armaments are merely an effect. They are not a cause. Wars existed long before modern implements of defence or offence were ever dreamed of. By the same token, we are often told that modern armaments make war more horrible. There may be isolated cases where modern arms have done that but certainly in the long run, he who neglects the lesson of history might make the claim, but the one who takes stock in history could not countenance it for a moment. History records for instance, that Gengis Khan built huge pyramids, captured human skulls and certainly he had not modern armaments; or, again, that during the Crusades, the streets ran ankle deep with blood, and the Crusaders would have been as much surprised at a machine gun as you and I, today, would be to see a modern army with a pick or a spear.

Then, we are told that modern armaments make war far more destructive and yet you can go back to the days of ancient history and find that the Romans destroyed ancient Carthage and Jerusalem, more completely than did all the might of the German artillery pounding away incessantly for four years, wreck the little town of Verdun.

No, Gentlemen, in my viewpoint, these inanimate things can not be ascribed as the causes of war. They are the effects. War is a matter of will or of intention. These inanimate things of guns and tanks and planes and rifles do not have wills of their own. They do not go about the world seeking whom they may destroy. They are only tools, tools, in the hand of a man and man, as one commentator has observed, is a more unstable compound that T and T.

Now, in giving you the viewpoint that some of us in the United States hold on this question, may I ask you for just a moment to recall the incident which occurred after the United States entered the World War, when General Pershing was assigned the task of leading overseas the complement of the American Army. If you will consult General Pershing's report, you will find he describes one of the first things he had to do upon arrival abroad; it was to arrange for the supply of our artillery which the American forces were to use and the General says in so many words in his report, that he considered himself and the American Army most fortunate in being able to arrange with the French Government for the supply of our artillery for the first two years. Now, why in the world did the Commanding General of the United States Army, in 1917, consider himself fortunate to make such an agreement? We might consider that due to the difficulties of shipping there might have been a loan for three months or six months or so. But why did he make the arrangements to get the artillery for two years and consider himself fortunate in being able to do so? Simply for one reason, he knew, and anyone else familiar with the problem knew, that despite its industrial power, despite its professional engineering ability, the United States did not have the facilities with which to produce that material and it would require safely, at least a year or a year and a half before American industry could begin to produce the things they needed of that nature.

The situation before the World War was that the United States Army owned and operated six manufacturing arsenals. It owns and operates the same six today. Before the World War there were a few, not more than a half dozen, private companies in the United States, who were actually producing in connection with their commercial production, some types of American ordnance. Today, we have the self-same six.

Now, the problem of producing these complicated things is so great that when the War came to the United States it was necessary for American industry to begin from scratch to build up the technique, the facilities with which to produce the things that the Army needed, and American industry, doing its best, took many a month before the job was even tackled. But tackle it American industry did and by November, 1918, there were five thousand separate contracts with private manufacturing of every phase of industry producing the armaments needed for our military forces. In addition, there were three thousand more contractors engaged in the production of secondary items, by which I mean, parts of the completed armaments. And, in addition to these there were 17,000 contractors engaged in supplying all types of munitions for the army, a total in all of approximately 25,000 contractors engaged in that huge task.

Of course, that put the nation on a war footing and promptly it returned to the things of peace. So in the United States, today, you still have the six government-owned and operated arsenals under the jurisdiction of the United States Army and a few companies who, encouraged by the United States Government, have kept up the manufacture of certain types, in very limited quantities, so that in the event of an emergency we will at least have that neucleus equipped through knowledge and facilities to begin the production of the things that we might need.

Might I just call your attention to one complication with regard to the actual production of these companies, these private companies and how much of that production goes abroad, You know if you listened to a great many critics of the munitions situation you would think there was a great deal of secrecy about this huge business that is going on under cover. Well, in the United States and I speak only for the situation in that country—I know little or nothing about it elsewhere—in the United States we have been publishing through the Department of Commerce, monthly statistics since the year 1922, showing by country of destination and by quantity the number of articles of a military nature produced by private manufacturers and sold to other countries. Now, it is difficult to find a common denominator, if you are trying to get some sort of a picture as to just how big this business is, but you can find a common denominator of weight and do you know, if you take the statistics for twelve years, from 1922 to the end of 1933, you find that the total shipment of military arms and military powder and explosives, the total shipment from the United States for twelve years, figures out as nine thousand, seven hundred and some odd tons for twelve years. Is that much or little? Well, the nearest comparison I can find is that it is just about the cargo of one modern ocean going freight vessel for the period of twelve years, so that this production which is going on is for the supply of other countries, mostly non-industrial countries. The countries that do not make their own armaments are the non-industrial countries and there are not more than ten industrial countries in the world today, so the other nations, not equipped to produce but which feel they have a certain requirement for armaments, both for their external and internal national defence are compelled to import the implements that they require from some producing country and the exports that have gone out from the United States are certainly, in the great majority of cases, for the legitimate national defence needs of some other country.

Now, there may be gun runners; there may be gun toters. If you are familiar with the prohibition situation in the United States for many long and arduous years, you would know there are bootleggers, but why in the world allow an abuse, if there are abuses, to result in any such thing as a philosophy which cannot distinguish between a legitimate use and an abuse? If there are unethical practices, by some particular individuals, certainly no sane, fair-minded person holds any brief for them, whatever. If there are gun runners, efforts should be made to curb their activities, but to say in one fell swoop that the remedy for this situation, the remedy for clearing out this individual who is supposed to go about the world fomenting war for his own profit is to eradicate the whole industry is certainly for one in the United States to make the same colossal mistake that was made when that philosophy was applied to whether one should or should not drink.

Now, what possible solutions are there for putting into some sort of control this thing that is a part of the national defence? Well, some students of the question say that we should have a nationalized industry, just as the trend seems to be in so many other fields today, to a nationalized industry of one type or another. Well, now, if the nationalized industry of arms making be able, economically to provide for one's national defence needs, certainly there could not be any complaint about it. But expert opinion in the United States regarding our own problem is that the six arsenals that the Army now has for the production of its military supplies and which are able to produce all and more of the limited peace time needs of the Army, those six arsenals in time of major war could not produce more than five per cent of the total military requirements. Now, taking the viewpoint of the realist, and national defence cannot be viewed in any other way, what would be necessary if we nationalize the industry in the United States? My view is we would have to have ample capacity ready to take care of any army required in the event of emergency and if we have only five per cent now, experts estimate that the facilities to produce one hundred per cent of the requirements in government-owned and operated establishments, would cost the taxpayers anywhere from a billion and a half to three billion dollars, simply to erect those facilities.

Now, leave out the great government payroll. Leave out amortization on such an investment as that, but capitalize it only at a very low interest figure and it certainly should be apparent that any such public expenditure would certainly be the most uneconomical way in which such a problem could be handled.

Now, if you were to have a nationalization and the elimination of the private manufacturer—it is all well and good to say that the private manufacturer is ruled out in time of peace, but everyone who studies the problem will grant that in time of war you need the private manufacturer, you need every bit of the industrial power of the country to produce these very things so that we have the very contradictory situation of a producer being forced out of business by law in time of peace, knowing full well that in the event of war, he is going to be urged and demanded to begin production of a thing about which he will then know very little, will have had no engineering experience and certainly will have a most expensive undertaking for himself and his government on his hands.

Now, there has been one suggestion made and it certainly is a logical one, and that is that the production and shipment of arms, particularly to certain areas of the world where trouble might be started through having such equipment, that the control be exerted of the export by all the countries of the world. I do not think any sane individual or any company would object to any such method as that—control by export license and publicity as to the figures of materials exported and countries of destination.

As a matter of fact, the United States Senate, last June, ratified a treaty providing for such form of control. That ratification was provisional upon a similar ratification by the other armed producing countries of the world and my last information was that there were some four or five that had not yet ratified it but I am sure that anyone familiar with the problem in the United States would agree that there is no objection whatsoever to a form of control through export licenses and through that method it might be possible to curb shipments, particularly by unconscionable individuals who, in all events, have no business being in such an enterprise anyway.

Consequently, it does seem to me that there is a great deal of ground for common sense in looking at such a problem as this. I don't think it is at all helpful to take the attitude of the agitator of the cynicalist in attempting to iron out any wrong that may exist in connection with this problem. It goes to the very deepest roots of a country's existence and many a country in the world is going to exert every power and influence within its possession to see that its right to get what it needs for its own defence is not going to be withdrawn from it.

The viewpoint of some of us in the United States is that the private manufacturer, limited in number, limited in quantity, producing as those private manufacturers are, is really a second line of the national defence because we know full well that in the event of a major emergency, industry and the professional engineer will have to attempt to do the job as best he may.

At a profit? Well, we hear a great deal about the profits of munition makers during the World War. And there were profits, just as there were mistakes and delays and waste in every phase of so great an undertaking about which we had very little experience to operate upon. But in all fairness, it is a gross misrepresentation to accuse the armament maker during the World War as having been the profiteer. If you examine the figures you find that inflation brought such great increases in price that there were very few forms of enterprise, of production or of personal service, which did not bring their particular form of high profit. For instance, you seldom hear it mentioned when we talk of war profits, that wheat, that all-important essential item without which an army cannot move—Napoleon said an army travels on its stomach—the price of wheat in June, 1914, in the United States, before the World War, and the price in June, 1916, at the peak of the World War, shows an increase of 138 per cent. Yet who ever thinks of accusing the wheat grower of the western plains as sharing in the profits of war? Cotton, without which a modern army could not last scarcely a day, the great essential component item of explosive powder, its price increased in the vicinity of 150 per cent, if my recollection is correct.

The general wholesale commodity index, comparing again the same dates, was about 98 per cent; the retail index, about 92 per cent. And, strange as it may seem, one of the great companies which today is being criticized most severely in the United States because of its manufacture of powder, while all this price rise was going on, two of their products, explosive powder made purely from cotton, alcohol and nitric acid, all of which components had climbed tremendously in price, the finished product of one of those great companies shows a decrease in price for one type of powder of eight per cent and a decrease in price for another type of twelve per cent.

So, that I say when we criticize the arms maker as the profiteer, at least we should be fair enough to grant that this thing of profit in war time is a matter of national policy that must approach every individual, share and share alike, so that there is no inordinate profit made by any individual or any group.

In the United States, that question has been studied thoroughly, long before this present great amount of talk was begun. A War Policy Commission in 1930 recommended that in time of war in the United States all profits have an excess profit tax of 95 per cent placed upon it, in addition to a system of price fixing, so that the inequalities of the high cost and the low cost producer might be ironed out through taxation.

Gentlemen, these are the broad outlines, I think, candidly and sincerely, the common sense of the question. If there be abuses, let's eradicate them. But I certainly think we are justified, we of the United States, in the policy that we are following which seeks war with no one, which wants to live on terms of justice and fairness with everyone, which has no thought of self-aggrandizement, which has no unjust aims that might result in war, while we hate war, we feel we must be prepared against it and we think we have ample authority in our own experience and in the experience of other nations to warrant that belief. Indeed, we have the great authority, the Bible, quotation, where we read, "When the strong man armed keepeth his court, those things which he possesseth are in peace." (Applause.)

GILBERT & SULLIVAN OPERAS

The D'OYLY CARTE OPERA COMPANY

Thursday, April 11, 1935

Mr. Dana Porter: Ladies and Gentlemen, we welcome today, the D'Oyly Carte Opera Company and their manager, Mr. Frank Hobbs, who have recently played in New York City on an engagement for one month but which was extended to four months. (Applause.) Gilbert and Sullivan Operas have at last captured New York. The amazing thing about Gilbert and Sullivan is that it seems to have qualities of eternal interest. If you saw "The Mikado" as staged in recent performances you would realize that music which was written in the 19th century is even more enhanced by 18th century scenery and it is perhaps more appreciated than ever by 20th century audiences. (Applause.)

Although this company retains most faithfully all the traditions of the original company that played these operas, nevertheless, as we welcome the new members of the cast—new members, leading stars, who were not with us on the last occasion when this company visited Toronto—we see that some new personalities are injected into these roles. They are still faithful but they are new. I have much pleasure in introducing the following members of the company. At my left, Miss Marjorie Eyre. (applause); Miss Kathleen Frances, (applause); Miss Elizabeth Nickell-Lean, (applause); Mr. John Dean, (applause); Mr. Charles Goulding, (applause); Mr. Sydney Granville, (applause); Mr. Martyn Green, (applause); Mr. Leslie Rands, (applause); Mr. Frank Stewart, (applause); Mr. Richard Walker, (applause); Mr. Isidore Godfrey, (applause); Mr. Harry Arnold, (applause) and Mr. Alan Ward, (applause.)

Before the members of this company entertain us with a few selections which they have most generously consented to do, I shall introduce Mr. Frank Hobbs, the manager of this company, who will speak on their behalf. (Applause.)

MR. FRANK HOBBS: Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I gather from your very warm applause we are not strangers to you. It would be rather funny if we were because this is the third time you have honored us by making us your guests here. On each occasion everybody thoroughly enjoyed themselves except the individual who has to address you. (Laughter.) I can speak for I am it on each occasion. (Laughter.) The knowledge that we are not forgotten was proved by a very pleasant gesture from a member of your executive who sent us a letter. Three years ago the head office in London received a letter saying that it was reported in the Toronto papers that we were contemplating another visit to Toronto and might they have the pleasure of entertaining the company during that visit and would we fix a date and let them know in due course.

We are very proud to be here because I know you have had many, many guests, many speakers and many outstanding personalities. We are proud to have been paid so great a compliment. I might also say that it is a great compliment to the company to see the big gathering here today. In my few remarks, I am going to use the word 'we' very often and you must take that in the sense that it applies to the company. I am not setting out as a manager to try and boost the company. You have shown that you know them too well by the marvellous attendance at the theatre and the generous applause on this present occasion.

When addressing the Empire Club one feels that the subject should be one which is related in some way to Empire. I am given to understand that I need not adhere too closely to that, which I think is a very good thing because you must have many eloquent speakers on that subject. I think possibly it would be of interest to know something about the visit of the D'Oyly Carte—I think I may say your D'Oyly Carte Company to the United States. (Applause.) I say your D'Oyly Carte Company because we are a British unit-wholly British throughout. (Applause.) British in manufacture, in composers, in personnel of the company—we are British throughout, even the clothes we wear are British so far as we know. (Laughter.) We brought a British product to America which they had had before, but not quite that British brand. It was with a great deal of diffidence that we went to New York. The New York theatre prides itself as living on the crest of the wave. Anything as old as Gilbert and Sullivan opera which had been before the public for 50 years—well it was very questionable for New Yorkers who live 24 hours to the day. We had been wanting to go to New York but we could not just walk in and give a play. Fortunately for us, Mr. Beck of New York was in Britain in the early part of last year. He was willing to waste an afternoon seeing one of our performances. He would have come the next night if he had not had to sail. He went straight to the London office and said, "I want your company any time in New York. If it is not a success I will get out of the theatrical business." Well, his words meant something. It was a great responsibility to move a company of 56 people with scenery for ten operas and costumes across the Atlantic. One thing we wanted to do particularly was to achieve an artistic success for Mr. Carte was an idealist. With these operas it was not so much the box office appeal, which is very necessary for our people have to be fed, but it was the artistic success he was interested in. That is the way we met with a great triumph in New York. We were all trembling on the opening night. I will never forget it. The house was absolutely packed. Before the night was over we were just almost swept out of the theatre by the tremendous enthusiasm. You cannot imagine the pride of the company and myself that this British Company went over there and gave them Gilbert and Sullivan, which they had seen for so many years, in a way they had never had in the United States before. It was the biggest compliment they could have paid, for they gave the impression they had never had Gilbert and Sullivan in the United States before. They could not pay a higher compliment than that. (Applause.) Now, I hope you feel proud of us. (Laughter and applause.) We were entertained right throughout and, speaking of our visit to the United States we can only speak of it in a very pleasant way. The people showed us the greatest kindness, courtesy and hospitality everywhere. We were entertained by some of the leading clubs in New York and entertained by very distinguished people down there. One Sunday night we were entertained—I will tell you of rather a unique incident—we were entertained at the Lotus Club in New York which has been in existence for many years. When Gilbert and Sullivan were in New York 50 years ago they entertained Gilbert and Sullivan and thought it would be a very good idea to entertain the Gilbert and Sullivan Company 50 years later. We had a marvellous night together. Amongst the speakers Professor William Lyons Phelps of Harvard University and Walter Damarosch. I cannot repeat what these two eloquent speakers said. I should simply blush. But that was the spirit we met everywhere in the United States.

There is also another angle which I think is of interest to you. That was the contacts we had with British Government officials throughout the States. We were official ambassadors for Britain wherever we went. We were marvellously received and the British consuls made sure we were introduced all round. They said, 'You are doing splendid work for us. You're doing very well. We will sit back and take the credit.' (Laughter.) As a matter of fact the British ambassador at Washington who entertained us said, 'Your company has done marvellous work for us in the States. I cannot explain what it is but you have. I thank you very much.' (Applause.)

Before I came along here I tried to collect a copy of a letter written by William Lyon Phelps to the press in the United States. It went round the whole circle of papers. He spoke most eloquently upon the fact of this British Company being in the States entertaining. Of course, we as ambassadors were in a very happy position of giving pleasure. He became a great friend of ours and entertained us at the house. He was also a very amusing speaker. I found most of the American speakers whom I listened to were out to catch the laughs. In fact we found the people throughout the whole of the States liked to laugh. If you can make them laugh you can have anything they have to give you. Our ambition was to make them laugh and forget what was going on outside. They entertained our people until 4 a.m. and I began to wonder how long the company was going to stand the pace. But there is something about the New York air which lets you live 20 out of the 24 hours. The other four you can just rest a little. (Laughter.)

We very nearly got into international complications when we were there through no fault of our own. We were in Philadelphia and just leaving for New York. The day we were leaving there a letter was published. I won't read the whole letter, I will just read a little part. It went on to say how much the opera had been enjoyed. I may say just at this time Washington had decided what they would do about gold. This is the last paragraph of the letter. 'If there were a way to keep them on this side permanently, I humbly suggest that the New Deal cancels Britain's war debt in exchange for the D'Oyly Carte.' (Applause and laughter.)

I am sorry our full cast are not able to be present today. You have shown so much hospitality that it is really remarkable so many are here. The others would loved to have been here but were prevented. We are going to try and give just a few musical numbers. They won't all be from operas because these are ensemble parts which require a chorus or three or four people to play. I am going to ask Mr. Godfrey to take over. I think he will take the musical program and anything I can do to help him, I will be only too pleased. (Applause.)

(Several members of the company took part in an enjoyable musical program which was climaxed by a number of stories told in the Yorkshire dialect by Mr. John Dean.)

AN ADDRESS BY MR. WALTER HUSTON

Thursday, April 25, 1935

MR. DANA PORTER: In the last few days we have read in the newspapers much about changes in the educational system in the schools of this Province. If education had been improved in the manner that they are now suggesting and if it had been made as attractive as they hope to make it, possibly we would not be introducing Mr. Huston today as the leading actor in the United States. We should be introducing him, perhaps, as some eminent representative of some profession or business in the City of Toronto because Mr. Huston, at an early age in life, decided that the lure of the stage was greater than the lure of the class room. And so he left Toronto to seek his fortune in New York City, where after a good many years of very hard work and not always at the outset the brilliant success, perhaps, that he dreamed of, Mr. Huston eventually attained the position which George M. Cohan and Mary Pickford both agree to be that of the leading actor in the United States. (Applause.)

I have very great pleasure in introducing Mr. Walter Huston. (Applause.)

MR. WALTER HUSTON—Gentlemen: It is a great pleasure to be here today and I understand a great honour to speak before The Empire Club of Canada. I want to say how pleased I have been with the most marvellous reception I have received since I came back to the town of my birth. I assure you that I have never done anything of importance enough to warrant it, but if I have fooled you into thinking I have, then I am satisfied.

I want to pay my respects, first of all to a Toronto girl who has been very kind and very wonderful to me—

Mary Pickford. While I am on the subject of Mary, I would like to tell you of a little thing that happened last year in New York. She came back stage to see me when I was playing "Dodsworth," and of course the autograph seekers were around. After they left I heard an argument going on between some of the autograph seekers and one said, "I will give you three Walter Hustons for one Mary Pickford." (Laughter.)

I have been asked several times why I went to so many schools in Toronto. Bill Wright, a friend of mine, after I had named about four, called me up and said, "What's the matter? You forgot about Victoria School." I want to tell you about that. The first school I went to, I didn't like the teacher; the second school I went to, the teacher didn't like me; and the third school, we didn't like each other, and so forth. I decided that the best thing to do was to quit.

My father who was a contractor then, had a shop on the corner of Bay and Richmond Streets in Toronto and he thought perhaps it would be a good idea if his son followed in his footsteps. So, I started at the bottom of the ladder, carrying shingles. I got to the roof the second day and I was carrying scantlings and lumber. It was hot and I decided after two days of that that the stage was a better occupation.

My first experience on the stage was here in Toronto with the Saint Simon's Church. We got up a Minstrel Show. We played at the Massey Hall. I was about sixteen years old at the time and I remember an old gentleman who came back to see me the other night—Mr. Kidner. He is eighty years old now. I remember the kind words of encouragement he gave me at that time. I sang a song called "Lindy, Ma Black Belle." I will sing the chorus for you. (Chorus sung by Mr. Huston.)

After we played Massey Hall we were engaged to play some clubs—we were rather good. The next day there was a smoker; the men went and I was included with the men. I went and sung my song, did a cake walk and told some funny jokes and the next morning I remember getting my gloves in my overcoat pocket and when I took them out they smelled of smoke. That was the first time I realized I was with the men and I was a man.

After that I joined a dramatic school; the Toronto College of Music had a dramatic school. I went to the school and attended about a month. We gave three plays at the Grand Opera House. A man by the name of H. M. Shaw was the Director. Two years ago in Hollywood, when I was out there making a picture he came in to see me—that was about thirty-four years after. I had him come in and I said, "What can I do for you?" He said, "Can you get me a job, as a butler or anything at all around here?" That is what the show business is.

I left Toronto. This is going to be kind of a history of me. I left Toronto and went out on the road with a little company. We were engaged for fifteen dollars a week. We never got the fifteen dollars a week, for in going with a company like that we played from one town to another, and finally the sheriff caught up. I think I still have a trunk in Onondaga, New York. There is a story about the theatrical company that got stranded and finally the manager of the hotel took the company over. He was a man with a long beard. They had played in a little rural place and the leading man came to the old gentleman and said, "How did you like my performance last night?" He replied, "O, pretty good." The leading man then said, "Do you think I could get a little advance?" They hadn't had any advances until the old gentleman joined the show. He said, "Yes, I think so", and he pushed his whiskers aside and reached into what we called the "Grouch bag", and gave him ten dollars." The next to the leading man heard of it and did the same thing and the story is that at the end of the season the old gentleman's whiskers were all growing out this way. (to one side)

I remember my first return to Toronto. We went to New York and had a rather tough time. Things didn't go so well but finally I got a job and I remember returning to Toronto with a brand new suit and forty dollars—a great accomplishment. Much more than it is now. I played in a stock company here, and I want to tell a little incident about my mother. I was playing "The Two Orphans" at the Majestic Theatre. I wore a square cut costume, and my legs were rather thin. Not wanting to display such spindles, I found a way of padding my legs and my mother fixed it up for me. When I was returning to New York, two girls were on the train and they recognized me. One of them said to my mother, "I saw him in the stock company. I want to tell you how much I think of the stock company and what beautifully shaped legs he had. My mother said, "Yes, I fixed them for him."

After several years of struggling along, I went into vaudeville. I always say and feel about vaudeville that it is the university of the theatre. Vaudeville is something in which everybody has to stand on their own. With a play like "Dodsworth", you learn your part and go out and it is all very simple. Vaudeville was a great experience and a great school. We had to get up our own acts. We had no advice; no one told us anything. I had to make good. Every afternoon was an opening night. That is why New York opening nights have always held little fear for me, because every afternoon in vaudeville seems to be an opening night. You have to depend on yourself in the competition you have from other people. I managed to make a fairly good living at vaudeville and I wrote some songs. The first time I played here in Toronto with my vaudeville act, I had a song called, "I Haven't Got The Do-Re-Me". I will sing one of the verses I made up while here in Toronto. This was in 1914, around there somewhere. I won't sing the whole song but I will give you an idea. The chorus ended with, "I Haven't got the do-re-me". I wrote a special verse:

They're going to build a depot here some day,

A depot that will cost ten million, so they say;
They've been too long in building, it really is a joke,
They've built a fence around it and now I think they're
broke,
They haven't got the do-re-me

It will never be on time,
It's something like the Grand Trunk Line,
Because thy haven't got the do-re-me.

That was twenty years ago, at least.

There are several stories I would like to tell you pertaining to vaudeville. I think perhaps vaudeville is pretty rich in the field of stories. I was playing a little town in Pennsylvania, one act, and my partner came to me and said that the manager wanted some photographs. I didn't have any photographs and I didn't have any money. I knew that there might be photographs that looked like me or my partner and I advised him to go to the town's leading photographer to see if he could get some photographs. He went down and selected some, came back and the manager of the theatre said, "How about the photographs? Have you got them?" He said, "Yes, here they are." The Manager looked at them and said, "What's this?" My partner said, "That's me." "You," said the manager, "That's a picture of the Mayor."

They tell a story about two vaudeville actors who went to London, two American actors. They arrived and one said, "I think I will go down stairs and take a look at the acts that we have to follow and see what they want here. I don't know whether they want the kind of material we have or not." One of them went downstairs and found the man he was to follow made up with a high green hat, a long red nose, a purple vest, a red coat and long shoes. He said, "If they want that in London, if that is the kind of material they want, we might as well go home." And he said to his partner, "You go down stairs and see what you think." The partner returned and said, "You saw the street man."

My experience toward the end of vaudeville was a little sad. I had struggled twelve years to get somewhere. I had put on a big act. After I had done this I thought I had a very good act but the Keith office said, "We don't want to pay that money," so the last time I played in Toronto was in the Princess Theatre when the Schubert units were playing there. After that season was over there was no place to go. I went to the Keith office and said that I would like to come back and work there. They said, "No, you have played opposition, you can't work for us any more." There was no place to go and it looked very sad. I found some letters of introduction—I have found they are never any good—and I went to many managers. Finally, Mr. Brock Pemberton produced a play called "Mr. Pitt" in New York. I played wtih "Mr. Pitt" and over night, the play, while not a success, put me over. I went along from there with O'Neill's "Desire Under The Elms." My grandfather helped me a great deal, not knowing it, being dead a long time, but his picture was typical of the kind of a man he was. He came from the north of Ireland and settled on a farm near Orangeville and I think the picture of the kind of man he was—he was a very religious man—helped me with that part. It seemed perfectly natural to do this part. He was a man of 78 years of age.

And I should like to mention another Canadian who, through all my vaudeville experience, was a great help to me—Miss May Irwin. She came, I think, from Whitby, and through all of my vaudeville experience May would come back to me, every year or so, wherever I was playing in New York. She would come back-stage to encourage me, not knowing I was a Canadian, and I not knowing she was a Canadian. It was a wonderful encouragement through all those years to have a woman as important as she come back and be so friendly. She would always send a telegram on the opening night of "Mr. Pitt." The first night she said that she felt like coming back and saying, "I told you so," I think that the finest encouragement I ever got from anyone in the early days was from May Irwin.

After you have reached a certain place of importance in the theatre, I think that you enjoy most when you first begin is to meet people of importance, people who really mean something in the theatre and out of the theatre—men like Jeffie Lasky, Eugene O'Neill, George M. Cohan. And I want to say about Mr. Cohan that he has said some very nice things. When I found out what he said in Toronto, I wired him that I wanted him to stop talking about me, going around the country like that. He was a great influence so far as acting was concerned. I will tell you of one instance: I was practicing the play one day. He said, "Will you say this line here? Will you pause as long as you think you ought to pause before you say the next line?" I said, "All right." He said, "Now, do that for yourself. I want you to do something for me." I said, "All right, what is it, George?" He said, "After you have paused as long as you think you ought to pause, then will you count ten slowly?" I said, "George, they won't stand for that. The audience would stand up and walk out." Well, I did that and I found I could have waited even until now, the audience was so patient. George Cohan is a master of the theatre. He knows pauses; he knows the theatre as nobody else does.

Many actors have quite a bit of criticism in regard to the critics. I have usually found the critics in New York to be perfectly all right. You wake up the next morning and you read the papers. You have appeared in the play and you are hoping, of course, that they will say the right thing, and the nice thing. They always tell the truth. They may be prejudiced here or there, but I have found that the critics are usually right. After you have played in a play, take your notices, put them in a scrap book and put them away and look at the scrap book five years later, when your perspective is a little different on the thing and you find they are entirely right.

A very amazing thing, I think, is the reaction we get from an audience while we are playing in a play. "Dodsworth" is an illustration. It means very much to the audience; the audience will become very much excited. They pay their money to see the play and they become very excited. They lose themselves in looking at the play and they speak up sometimes. The other night in New York, in the scene where Miss Bainton is telling me she is going to marry the young German boy and the audience is very much upset, a gentleman in the back of the theatre spoke up very loudly and said, "Throttle her." Those things happen, where they forget entirely what they are doing and saying.

I played in a play in which I had to sign a paper that the audience didn't want me to sign, and they very often spoke up and said, "Don't sign, Sam." I remember once, looking down at the audience and in the front row was a little old, gay-haired lady. I was playing it up, of course, and I looked down; she shook her head, "No, no."

I would like to say a few words about Hollywood. I think Hollywood is a pretty good place. My first experience was when I went to do "The Virginian." I was out on vacation and I was asked if I could ride a horse. I hadn't ridden a horse for years. However, they gave me the horse and I managed to ride it. Then they gave me the lines to study and I went and studied them beside a little brook. I heard something rattling in the bushes and it was a rattle snake. When a actor comes from New York to Hollywood and is up against such things as that it makes it a little difficult sometimes. I find that you don't have a chance to do as really good a job as you can do. The salaries are very good—nothing to complain about. You miss your contact with the audience. After you have been out there playing for a while just before the camera you miss the personal contact with the audience. After I had arrived there and played in two or three pictures I signed some contracts and I received a telegram from my son. He said, "I see you have signed a contract to do twelve pictures a year for ten years. If this is so, when are you going to get a chance to practice acting?" The one objection I find is that you jump around so much in the making of a picture. In a play you start with the first act; you rehearse the first scene, then the second and the third act and we know what we are going to do in the end. We know what we are going to do in the last act. In making pictures, they start in the middle of the picture, perhaps jump to the fore part or possibly to the last part and you jump around on it.

I made a picture with Miss Dunn—I forget the name of the picture. I had never met her and I was called down from our place up in the mountains to make the scene. We hadn't rehearsed it; we just go in and do it. In the scene she was telling me that she was expecting a little stranger. After the scene was over she said, "We have never been properly introduced; I have never met you before." We got the Director to introduce us.

(Laughter).

I would like to speak of another Canadian who seems to have gotten along pretty well in the world—Aimee Semple MacPherson. I will have to tell of a little experience I had with Aimee in Hollywood. I had made a picture called "The Wet Parade." They needed a little added publicity and they said it would be a very good idea if they could have a debate on the liquor question with somebody of importance, and they found Aimee. Aimee said, "Yes, I will do that, providing I win." So it was agreed that Aimee would win and we were to hold the debate in the Temple. I was against Prohibition and she was for it. I will never forget the night. There was a long room toward the amphitheatre of the Temple and we walked down, arm in arm, she had lillies on, and we went on to the debate. The place was filled, outside and inside. Finally, the returns came in, 22,000 in favour of me, and 10,000 for Aimee, but it was reversed and so Aimee won.

The life in Hollywood for an actor is not very long. They get tremendous salaries but the life of the average star in Hollywood is about three or four years. After that they sink. The life of the average feature player is about six or seven years.

I want to tell you a little story about the people of importance who come to Hollywood. Lord Burleigh came to Hollywood and being a very important person he was being shown around the studios. He was being taken around by Bill Hughberry, who never knew who they were but always introduced them by saying, "I don't know who he is but he is somebody. When he was told that the person was Lord Burleigh, there was a very sudden change in his attitude. He took Lord Burleigh around the studio and everybody was very glad to see him.

This little speech of mine has been a sort of a rambling affair. I have touched on the legitimate and the motion picture, and vaudeville, and the radio is the fourth point of amusement. The radio is becoming a very important asset to the actor. About three or four months ago I played on one of the first hours of a dramatic play. At the time we thought it wouldn't be very good but since it has developed into the Lux Hour, a very important hour on the radio. The salaries are good and it is rather good work; we rather enjoy it. One of the last broadcasts I made was for the Imperial Tobacco Company of Canada. The way they did it was rather interesting. I spoke about a minute. They fitted up a radio in the dressing room and they had me timed exactly and I had to get off at just such a time and get up and make the little speech. We were connected with Montreal, Nova Scotia, with a gold mine in Northern Canada, with Vancouver and with Hollywood, and with ear phones we rehearsed that and played it the next night. I think it is a rather interesting thing how they handle those things.

I would like to get back to the legitimate again and say what a pleasant time I have had in playing "Dodsworth." Some two months ago we were playing in Washington and the President came to the play. He sent word back-stage, inviting Mrs. Huston and Miss Bainton and myself to come to the White House. He spoke about the play and he spoke of one line, where Miss Bainton is complaining that I do not understand civilization in Europe, and of a line which says, "Well, maybe I don't care about civilization in Europe; maybe clean hospitals, concrete high-roads and no Canadian soldiers along the Canadian border come nearer to my idea of civilization." The President said, "I would like to tell you a little story in connection with that. A short time ago we had the idea of patrolling the Canadian border and of having the Canadian pilot and the American pilot in the same ship, and just as we had the idea, Canada had the same idea. So, today, the Canadian border is patrolled with one officer who is a Canadian and one officer who is an American. If an arrest is to be made on the Canadian side the ship lands and the Canadian officer makes the arrest; and if it is on the American side the American officer makes the arrest and they split the expenses." (Applause).

Last summer I had a rather nice experience. We went to Central City, which is a small town on the coast. We did Othello there. Robert Edward Jones, who is now my brother-in-law was there and also Barry Jones and his wife. Jones was working on Hamlet and he and his wife helped me tremendously. We worked on Othello. It was a rather nice experience to go up to the old town, where some 180 billion dollars had been taken out in gold. All the gold had gone and there was nothing there but the beautiful old theatre. We went up and really had a marvellous experience. It was most thrilling doing Shakespeare. It was the first time I had ever done Shakespeare. We worked rather hard on it and when you get on the subject of Othello, I would be very glad to do the whole play for you if I could. I think I will finish this little speech this afternoon by reading one of Othello's speeches if you would like to hear it:

(Applause).

Her father lov'd me; oft invited me;
Still questioned me the story of my life,
From year to year,—the battles, sieges, fortunes,
That I have pass'd.
I ran it through, even from my boyish days
To the very moment that he bade me tell it:
Wherein I spake of most disastrous chances,
Of moving accidents by flood and field;
Of hairbreadth scapes i' the imminent deadly breach;
Of being taken by the insolent foe,
And sold to slavery; of my redemption thence,
And portance in my travel's history:
Wherein of antres vast and deserts idle,
Rough quarries, rocks, and hills whose heads touch heaven,
It was my hint to speak,—such was the process;
And of the Cannibals that each other eat,
The Anthropophagi, and men whose heads
Do grow beneath their shoulders. This to hear
Would Desdemona seriously incline:
But still the house affairs would draw her thence;
Which ever as she could with haste despatch,
She'd come again, and with a greedy ear
Devour up my discourse; which I observing,
Took once a plaint hour; and found good means
To draw from her a prayer of earnest heart
That I would all my pilgrimage dilate,
Whereof by parcels she had something heard,
But not intentively: I did consent;
And often did beguile her of her tears,
When I did speak of some distressful stroke
That my youth suffer'd. My story being done,
She gave me for my pains a world of sighs:
She swore,—in faith, 'twas strange, 'twas passing strange;
'Twas pitiful, 'twas wondrous pitiful:
She wish'd she had not heard it; yet she wish'd
That heaven had made her such a man: she thank'd me;

And bade me, if I had a friend that lov'd her,
I should but teach him how to tell my story,
And that would woo her. Upon this hint I spake:
She lov'd me for the dangers I had pass'd;
And I lov'd her that she did pity them.
This only is the witchcraft I have us'd. (Applause).

Mr. Porter, the retiring President of The Empire Club asked Mr. J. H. Brace, the President-Elect to express to Mr. Huston the thanks of the Club for his address.

MR. J. H. BRACE: Mr. Huston and Gentlemen: It is very kind of Mr. Porter to call upon me at this time. As he said, this is the last meeting of the Empire Club for this year. I think it has been one of the most successful years in the Club's history. I believe I am expressing the thought of all of the members of the Club in saying that for the accomplishments of this year we are truly grateful to Mr. Porter and to all who have assisted him.

Mr. Huston, may I say on behalf of the Club that we appreciate very much your coming and talking to us today. The intimate stories of on the stage and off the stage, I know have been appreciated by all and we will follow your career in the future, possibly to a greater extent than we have in the past. On behalf of the Club, Mr. Huston, I wish to extend to you our very deep thanks.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY IN GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES

AN ADDRESS BY H. CARL GOLDENBERG, M.A., B.C.L.

The following address was erroneously omitted from the 1933-34 Year Book.

Thursday, March 15, 1934

The regular luncheon meeting of The Empire Club was held on Thursday, March 15, 1934, with Mr. H. Carl Goldenberg, M.A., B.C.L., of Montreal as the Guest Speaker.

MAJOR BAXTER: Gentlemen, the subject of our guest speaker's address today is one of the most vital topics ever laid before this Club. Economic recovery is a burning question, not with one nation but with practically the entire civilized world and all their people. Whether it was the stunning expenditure of the last War, the fevered over-production of manufacturers, or merely a natural cycle, does not count with the man in the street today. All he knows is that since the fateful days of 1929 he has seen his margin of security vanish employment at a premium and his comfort and happiness menaced by prolonged depression.

Now, however there is a brightening in the horizon. We in Canada are already experiencing an upturn in industry and employment. Only the other day our newspapers brightened our breakfast tables with news of a boom in the Maritimes—and this morning I saw a robin on the top of Casa Loma. (Laughter.) Government reports are equally encouraging as to business conditions generally, showing rising indices and strengthening trade. Over to the east of us Great Britain, burdened as she is by taxation and debts, is feeling the firm ground again beneath her feet and her people, resilient as ever, are looking to the future with brighter hope and courage. To the south of us the United States, led by a great experimenter is working out its own salvation.

Before calling on our guest speaker, I would like to pay a tribute to his attainments. Mr. Goldenberg has many academic honours to his credit. In addition he is Sessional Lecturer in Economics at McGill and Lecturer in economics under the Montreal Board of Trade. When he is not doing this, he tells me he practices law.

Mr. Goldenberg was Chairman of the round table on "Trade, Tariffs and Preferences" at the Liberal Summer Conference, where he had such distinguished pupils as the Right Honourable MacKenzie King. He was also on the secretariat of the British Commonwealth Relations Conference at Toronto in 1933. Thus he is right at home with a subject on which most of us, in regard to its deeper aspects, are merely laymen.

I have much pleasure in introducing Mr. Carl Goldenberg.

MR. CARL GOLDENBERG: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: Your Chairman's kind references to myself and to my subject remind me of the story of the Judge who was refusing to allow a lady to withdraw a charge of non-support she had laid against her husband. "But, my Lord," she pleaded, "if you imprison him I shall lose my source of income. Let God be his Judge, my Lord." "No, madame," replied his Lordship, "this is too serious a matter. I must look into this myself." (Laughter.)

I must confess that in attempting to estimate the effects of the economic policies of Great Britain and the United States in the past few years, I, too, have often come to the conclusion that "the Lord only knows"; but your Chairman has decreed that this afternoon I must look into the subject myself and I shall attempt to do so.

Let us recall briefly the background of current economic events. In the latter part of the nineteenth century and in the earlier years of the twentieth, the world order was one of comparative economic internationalism. There were tariffs and other restrictions, of course; it would be a false pretence to claim, proudly or otherwise, that our age invented tariffs and trade restrictions. Nevertheless, in those years international trade followed fairly well established channels and the changes from year to year were relatively small. The more advanced and industrialized European nations were in a position to dispose of their surplus products in more backward countries, and also to invest their surplus capital to aid in the growth and development of these countries.

In this way England built up her large staple industries and her investments abroad. For some time, as a matter of fact, England had a virtual monopoly of foreign trade. The greater efficiency of production of her industries gave her an advantage over others. Naturally, she began to specialize in certain particular industries and concentrated upon textiles, metals, coal and chemicals. Consequently, England became dependent to a tremendous extent on her exports of a comparatively narrow range of commodities. As a matter of fact, among raw materials, coal is the only really important export of Great Britain. The great bulk of her export trade is done in manufactured goods. But, as the years passed by, the more backward countries of the world became less backward; they became industrialized; they began to offer a smaller market for the surplus products of the more advanced nations. New manufacturing industries were established in other states and they began to offer serious competition to the older industries of Great Britain. There began a great rivalry for markets, particularly between Great Britain and Germany in the years preceding the War. Then came the World War.

The World War gave a great impetus to further industrialization. The industrial machine of many countries grew with the abnormal demands of the war period, and when the War terminated the industrial machine remained. It produced, it continued producing, and it wanted to produce more and more.

The Great War had one other effect. It changed the economic impact of America. We must recall that up to 1913, the United States was a great debtor nation. It now became the world's great creditor nation and at the same time it became a competitor for export markets.

Then came the Peace. The Treaty of Versailles carved new states out of the old European Empires. Nationalism was the dominant political and economic force in these new states. They sought greater power and greater independence through economic self-sufficiency. Agricultural states sought to become industrialized. The home market was to be preserved for home industry. Imports were to be warded off like invasions.

The world, at the end of the War, therefore, was a far different world from that of 1914. Industrialization had advanced rapidly, and was making rapid strides in the Far East, in Japan. Nations dependent on export trade were no longer secure. In particular, the foundations upon which Great Britain's industries had been erected were threatened. In consequence, some of England's export industries are now not in their fourth but in their fourteenth year of depression.

We recall that the termination of the War was followed, respectively, by a short-lived boom, a slump and a period of recovery which set in in 1924. Production was increasing and a large volume of international trade was supported principally by American loans to Europe. Yet, during that period, Great Britain continued to experience a large volume of unemployment, particularly in her export trades. The too precipitate return to the gold standard in 1925 aggravated the difficulty. Sterling was overvalued in terms of gold and therefore created a further hindrance to export industries. England, therefore, could not share in the wild optimism of the United States.

The American boom of those years concealed the fact that during this period the purchasing power of the American farmer was relatively declining; that workers were coming into the city where work was not available; that the increased production of the American industries was made possible by mechanization and rationalization at the expense of labour. Rationalization means economy of labour.

In other words, America was increasing her output at a rate far exceeding the purchasing power of the masses to consume that output. But, the American is a born speculator. He would not reason. Hence, the stock market boom; hence, the withdrawal of American loans from Europe; hence, the attraction of European liquid funds to Wall Street. The effect on Europe was disastrous. Then came the Wall Street crash with its repercussions throughout the world. The crisis set in; it gathered momentum; it destroyed world confidence and finally, disrupted world currencies. In September, 1931, Great Britain suspended the gold standard. Political and economic upheavals followed in vastly different parts of the world.

The excess of optimism of the American citizen gave way to an excess of pessimism. The Englishman, of a more equable temper and more accustomed to hard times, remained calm. But, as the depression continued, it became apparent that the situation in the United States was far more complex and more serious than the situation in Great Britain. And it is in the light of these differences that we must consider the economic policies of the two nations.

It is well to recall, first, that Great Britain was far better equipped to meet the consequences and the terrors of a prolonged depression. If a workingman lost his job and exhausted his savings in the United States, he remained with only two alternatives: first, recourse to private charity; the second, starvation.

In striking contrast to this state of affairs is the relative security of the British worker. In 1911, the British Parliament had introduced a scheme of unemployment insurance. That scheme has been gradually extended and it now covers sixteen million persons, about four-fifths of all those gainfully employed and virtually all the wage earners of the country. The system has stood the test of more than twenty years and also the test of a period of rapidly increasingly unemployment. The certainty of receiving a minimum weekly sum has maintained the spending power of the British worker and has served to stabilize British industry. Whereas unemployment and the consequent dependence upon private charity in the United States means an almost total curtailment of expenditures by the unemployed American citizen and a consequent shutting down of plants and an increase in unemployment, British industry was always assured of a minimum home market. Hence, the importance of the British unemployment insurance scheme in preserving the morale of the working classes and in assuring a certain stability to industry.

When, owing to the painful increase in unemployment, the British unemployment insurance scheme could not be maintained on an actuarial basis, Great Britain, extended the existing machinery for administering the necessary relief to the unemployed.

In the United States, delay and suffering was inevitable. They had to administer relief but they also had to create the machinery which did not exist. In England they could avail themselves of the machinery created by the unemployment insurance system.

I do not mean to convey the impression that the unemployed in England are or were in receipt of a large or adequate relief. But the fact remains that the English worker was afforded a minimum of security and, therefore, English industry was afforded a minimum of security. It has rightly been said that with his unemployment insurance, his health insurance and his old age pension, the British worker would not trade his security for any American wage, however high it may be.

Unemployment insurance is, then, an integral part of England's industrial organization. It has enabled England to withstand the shock of the industrial crisis with greater resistance than the more powerful United States.

Let us recall, furthermore, as Professor T. E. Gregory of the University of London has pointed out, that the fall of prices in the United States led directly to three distinct, though associated, groups of difficulties. The first was unemployment on a vast scale. This was the industrial problem. The second was the plight of the farmer who was being ground to powder between the upper millstone of falling prices and the lower millstone of mortgage indebtedness. This was and is the American agricultural problem. The third problem was the effect of the agricultural and industrial distress upon the banking situation and upon governmental finance. This constitutes the financial problem.

While Great Britain is familiar with unemployment on a large scale and is also familiar with the problem of unbalanced budgets, she has no agricultural problem parallel to that of the United States. Fortunately, also, England's banking system is different, and, therefore, she did not have to face a banking crisis similar to that of March 1933 in the United States. We recall that the banks in that country were closed over a certain period of time.

Hence, the peculiar characteristics of the American economic experiment are attributable in large part to the greater seriousness and complexity of the economic crisis in the United States.

What did the Roosevelt administration undertake as a solution for the industrial problem? The administration formulated the NIRA. The NIRA is founded upon the realization that the American industrial machine is based upon mass production; that mass production is dependent upon mass consumption and that there cannot be mass consumption so long as a large part of the population is living on a mere subsistence basis.

Professor Rexford Tugwell, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, has written, "We have been led in bitter times to see that unless the agricultural, the labour and the office worker groups in America who comprise in all America the great body of our consumers, unless these are provided with buying power, our whole economic structure falls into idleness and ruin." Hence, the success of the NIRA is dependent upon increased purchasing power and increased consumption.

The Act seeks to accomplish this, first, by reducing the working hours per week, and thereby forcing the employment of more workers; secondly, by raising the wages of the lowest paid workers and thereby increasing their purchasing power; thirdly, by encouraging the organization of the workers into effective unions, thereby promoting efforts to raise their standards of living; and, lastly, by bringing order into industry through the abolition of unfair competition and the introduction of an element of economic planning. Every industry is called upon to produce a code, regulating competition within the industry.

The evils of child labour and the sweat-shops are to be abolished. The President is given the power to license businesses in order to secure adherence to the Act, in the event that codes are violated.

Having regard to the fact that Americans are presumed to be "rugged individualists," one can describe the NIRA as nothing but a revolutionary measure. To the extent that President Roosevelt seeks to carry out a program of social reform it is not, certainly not, revolutionary to an Englishman. President Roosevelt seeks to enforce the recognition of trade unions, but England legalized trade unions in 1871, and we know they are a very powerful force in the nation.

President Roosevelt seeks to abolish the evils of child labour, but the first Act passed by the Parliament at

Westminster limiting the hours of labour of children was passed in 1819, and was extended to women in 1844.

Finally, he seeks to enforce a minimum wage. England established trade boards in 1909 and enforced a minimum wage in certain industries. In addition, Great Britain has introduced schemes for unemployment insurance, old age pensions and health insurance.

But I do not make these statements because I want to detract from the merits of what President Roosevelt has done and is doing. If he has accomplished nothing else, he has made the American citizen think in terms of social welfare. He has introduced new social concepts in the United States, and to my mind that alone justifies his great experiment.

President Roosevelt is now being attacked by men who originally supported his efforts. I think there is some justification for saying that, though some of the big business men admit that Roosevelt saved the country, they are beginning to fear he won't give it back to them. That is why they are opposing him.

I think that there is also justification for the statement that the captains of industry in the United States are willing to allow the government to own, control and administer any industry, so long as it is an industry which does not pay dividends. As soon as it begins producing dividends the government must relax its hold.

In order to sustain the revival of business and the volume of employment the government has appropriated about three billion, three hundred million dollars for public works. With the N.I.R.A., this is the government's solution, or attempt at a solution, of the industrial problem.

As for the agricultural problem, the administration formulated the Agricultural Adjustment Act whereby it undertakes to subsidize restriction of output. The Secretary of Agriculture levies a processing tax on certain agricultural products, and pays a bounty out of the proceeds to farmers and other producers as compensation for reduced acreage.

It is hoped by this means to restore to the farmer his average real purchasing power of the period from 1909 to 1914. Whether the scheme is justified or not, and I have a great deal of hesitation about it, I must say that it has greatly increased the income of the American farmer and the American cotton grower and has thereby prevented a real farmers' revolt.

The Agricultural Adjusment Act also provides for inflationary measures and authorizes the devaluation of the dollar by fifty per cent.

The Banking problem has led to legislation disassociating banks from their security affiliates—a system which had resulted in many abuses. A system of insurance of bank deposits has also been introduced, as well as the drastic Securities Act, regulating the issuing and marketing of securities.

Finally, the Administration indulged in monetary experiments aiming to restore the price level of 1926. It is hoped that the rise in prices will diminish the burden of indebtedness. With the same end in view, farm and home mortgages have been refinanced at lower rates of interest.

This, in summary, is the Roosevelt Recovery Programme. It has necessitated the creation of a large number of new governmental organizations. It has been accompanied by noise and theatricals in order to retain the support of the public. It has definitely improved the nation's psychology and has developed a feeling of confidence and optimism. This is invaluable for recovery.

Have President Roosevelt's efforts been justified? In judging them, we must remember that they constitute an experiment. The United States was faced with a desperate situation in March, 1933, and the legislation which I have outlined is the result. Orthodox economists regard the experiments as a violation of all fundamental economic laws. The classical economic theory of a depression is that it is self-limiting. It is caused by overproduction which is naturally followed by declining industrial activity, unemployment and bankruptcy. "Gradually", says the classical economist, "the surplus of commodities will be consumed because of the necessity of replacements and renewals. Through the law of supply and demand, recovery will take place—somewhere, sometime, an effective demand for goods is going to appear." But there is a limit to human patience. The interval between collapse and recovery may be too long. Furthermore, the situation today is different from that of previous depressions.

Where is this new effective demand to come from? We escaped from past depressions through expanding foreign markets, or an increasing population at home, or the heavy demands of some new industry, like the automobile industry in the first decade of this century. None of these exist today; hence, the United States is trying to build up a larger domestic market through an increase of purchasing power at home.

The NIRA is not above criticism. It seeks to accomplish three things simultaneously: a rise in prices, a rise in wages, and an increase in production. If the rise in prices exceeds the rise in wages, the real purchasing power of the worker is going to decline. Also a reduction of the hours of labour with higher rates of wages may encourage the further mechanization of industry. Lastly, the financing of the programme will mean a heavy addition to the national debt. But even if the debt rises to thirty-two billion dollars, let us remember that it will be about equal to the debt of Great Britain and will be distributed amongst a population two and a half times as large as that of Great Britain.

In the meantime, there is no doubt that recovery in the United States has set in. *The New York Times* index of industrial activity shows a gain of thirty per cent as compared with a year ago. Employment in manufacturing industries has increased by about twenty-five per cent over the level of March, 1933, and payrolls were forty-eight per cent higher.

To what extent gains are real and to what extent they may be attributed solely to extraordinary governmental expenditures is a matter of argument. There is little doubt that the principal stimulus has come from the spending of government money.

Now, while recovery in the United States did not set in until April, 1933, recovery in England appears to have begun in the middle of 1932. We remember that in 1931, Great Britain departed from her classical policy of free trade and adopted a protective tariff in order to readjust the international balance of payments. The unfavourable balance of trade in England was, of course, not a new thing but a great decline in commodity exports had taken place also in other exports. So England adopted a protective tariff as an emergency measure. That has had important consequences.

It is notable that the depression did not strike the British productive system in the same way that it struck the American productive system. The British home market has shown, throughout the depression, an astonishing power of resistance, and the present recovery in Britain is confined to the home market. While there was an increase in industrial production in 1933, the volume of exports did not increase to a notable extent over 1932; therefore, the increased production must have been consumed at home.

While Britain's basic industries are still depressed her secondary industries—automobiles, food products, electrical appliances—are experiencing a period of expansion. Economic activity is being transferred, to some extent from the older staple industries to the newer secondary industries. By far the larger part of the trade expansion has been occasioned by the recent tariff, but we must remember that a tariff is a burden on export trade and Britain's national economy is dependent on foreign trade. Only a limited prosperity can be built on the home market alone. The likelihood of reviving foreign markets in a world of economic nationalism is, unfortunately, remote. I fear that the British cotton, coal, iron and steel industries may have to be reconciled with operating at a fraction of their capacity.

In Great Britain as in the United States there is now a movement for industrial re-organization. It is not as all-inclusive as the provisions of the NIRA but we know that in 1930 the British Parliament passed a Coal Mines Act, aiming to regulate and facilitate the production, supply and sale of coal. A Commission was set up to further the re-organization of the industry.

The steel industry is now being re-organized through the creation of a central body and subsidiary organizations empowered to control manufacturing and marketing activities. In other words, free competition in England is giving way to regulation. The Agricultural Marketing Act is a very radical piece of legislation and gives the Minister of Agriculture a close supervision over the quantities of certain commodities produced. Government intervention appears more frequently and compulsory legislation may shortly be introduced.

While England's policy is not spectacular in the sense that the United States' policy is spectacular, I believe it is wrong to refer to it as a policy of "statesmanlike inaction." It is not a policy of inaction. Great Britain, in some respects, is re-organizing her industry like the United States is doing, and we should also remember that Great Britain has been more successful than the United States in reducing the burden of debt through loan conversions.

It appears that Great Britain has suffered less and recovered more rapidly than any other country from the destruction of the last three years. To what extent the recovery will go—having regard to her export industries—it is difficult to predict, but it is true that England's recovery has been more marked.

I have spoken at somewhat great length of England

and the United States. Let me ask a final question: What is the outlook for Canada in this world of economic nationalism? Let us recall for a moment the economic structure of our country. We have a small home market for about ten and a half million people. The industrialized provinces of Eastern Canada are dependent upon the purchasing power of the domestic market and upon foreign markets for the absorption of their output. Our agricultural provinces in Western Canada, with a potential production and an actual production far exceeding the power of the home market to consume the output, are, therefore, principally concerned with export trade.

Hence, with a far smaller home market and less variety of natural resources than the United States, our Canadian national economy is dependent upon the marketing of our exportable surpluses. We normally export over thirty per cent of our net annual national production and about two thirds of our exports consists of primary products —products of the farm, the mine and the forest. As a debtor nation we were able until recent years, to balance our national budget by the export of our agricultural products, but the situation has radically changed. There has been a terrific and disproportionate fall in the prices of raw commodities. Foreign countries, whether justifiably or not, are encouraging native agriculture by means of tariffs, exchange restrictions, subsidies and quotas.

The consequences have been a drastic fall in the value of raw commodity exports. Our home market has, therefore, been restricted still further. In addition, we must bear in mind the fact that the United States—our principal customer and the country with which it is most natural for us to trade—the United States is now engaged in an experiment in compartaive self-sufficiency. This bond is bound to affect our exports. We must not overlook the foreign implications of the American recovery program.

If we are to meet the problems created by a declining world trade Canada cannot afford to pursue a policy of drift. Canada must deliberately seek to expand both the domestic and foreign markets for her products. The domestic market can be expanded by raising the purchasing power of the Canadian consumer, even as President Roosevelt is seeking to raise the purchasing power of the American consumer. It requires co-operation between the federal and provincial authorities. I can not be convinced that such co-operation is impossible. In the matter of foreign trade it appears to me that the old order, for the moment at least, is dead and must give way to a new order. It is giving way to a new order of controlled and negotiated trade. Foreign countries will agree to buy Canadian products if Canada is prepared to buy their products. We must be prepared to import if we are going to dispose of our exportable surpluses. In other words, trade should be reciprocal.

We must follow the policy which President Roosevelt enunciated in a message to Congress, as follows: "All of us are seeking the restoration of commerce in ways which will preclude the building up of large favourable trade balances by any one nation at the expense of trade debts on the part of other nations." Of course, it is for the United States to learn this lesson first.

As far as the immediate future is concerned it appears to me that world trade and Canada's part in world trade can only be revived by reciprocal trade treaties between nations or groups of nations. These treaties should regulate exports and imports, in order to afford a relative certainty as to markets to agricultural and other producers who must export commodities. And I have hopes that there may yet emerge a regulated international trade out of the chaos and anarchy of the present.

In conclusion, I feel that economic recovery has set in but we know only too well that it has not gone far. To a large extent it is artificial. There are still an appalling number of unemployed. International trade is still very restricted. Worst of all, economic nationalism is still rampant. I am convinced, while the recovery may continue, there will be no real recovery until there has been a revival of international economic co-operation.

I thank you. (Prolonged Applause).

MAJOR BAXTER: Mr. Goldenberg, it is a pleasant privilege to thank you for the very fine address you have given us today. As I said previously, recovery is a matter which is on the lips and in the hearts of every citizen and we are all looking forward to a return of that security, comfort and prosperity which we so carelessly took for granted in 1928.

It has been my privilege within the past week to witness visible evidences throughout the southern United States of the return of prosperity. Building, particularly in the playgrounds of Florida, is very active. Accommodation is very limited. Throughout the whole of a trip throughout the United States, actual evidence of the cleanup accomplished by the employment of vast numbers of men under the C. W. A. is visible. If the backyards have been cleaned up, the next job is the suburbs and that applies not only to the States, but to Canada.

You have given an impartial and objective view of this recovery and we trust that the future will abundantly confirm your views. (Applause).

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

Thursday, April 4, 1935

The Annual Meeting of the Empire Club of Canada was held in the Royal York Hotel, Toronto, Canada, on April 4th, 1935, with the President, Mr. Dana Porter, in the Chair.

It was moved by Mr. Hargraft,
Seconded by Mr. Harcourt,
THAT the Report of the Secretary be taken as read.

CARRIED,

PRESIDENT PORTER: I may say when this year commenced there was a considerable deficit which had piled up over a long period of years, in the neighbourhood of about $1,000., and largely as a result of the effort of the Honorary Secretary, Mr. H. F. Powell, who has carried on the very onerous duties of Secretary without remuneration, the Club now hopes by the end of the current year to end up with, perhaps, a slight surplus.

I may also say the membership is up slightly from what it was last year. I have before me the Report of the Nominating Committee, appointed at a meeting of this Club about six weeks ago. The Nominating Committee makes the following report:

President	J. H. Brace
1st Vice-President	H. C. Bourlier
2nd Vice-President	J. S. P. Armstrong
3rd Vice-President	Beverley Matthews
Honorary Secretary	H. F. Powell
Honorary Treasurer	Howard Webster

Executive: Dana Porter, F. B. Fetherstonaugh, Main Johnson, B. K. Sandwell, Princ. Malcolm Wallace, J. P. Pratt, Major Gordon Balfour, E. F. Thompson, R. M.

Harcourt, George C. Gale, W. M. Hargraft, G. D. Davis, George A. Drew, F. H. Barlow, R. V. LeSueur, Graeme Watson, W. MacBrien, A. G. Stewart, Col. Alex Fraser, Robert Fennell, Hugh Eayrs.

It was moved by Mr. Wilkinson,

Seconded by Colonel Kirkpatrick,

THAT the Report of the Nominating Committee be adopted.

CARRIED.

PRESIDENT PORTER: I have much pleasure in welcoming to the Chair of this Club, our new President, Mr. Brace.

I am told that Mr. Brace is more interested in fishing even, perhaps, than he is in the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, and it is perhaps about time we had a renowned fisherman in the Chair of this Club. Mr. Brace, in his spare time for the last 26 years has been identified with the Bell Telephone Company of which he is now the General Manager for the Western area. He has been associated with this Club on its executive for many years and has always contributed most effective advice and assistance in every respect. I consider we have got a President of very great value to the Club and I should like to call on Mr. Brace now.

MR. J. H. BRACE: Mr. President and Gentlemen: It is rather difficult to answer the tribute that has just been paid to me, both as to my fishing ability and any other phases of my occupation.

I appreciate very much indeed the honour conferred upon me in electing me as President of The Empire Club of Canada for the ensuing year.

Just at this time. I would like to pay tribute to our President, Mr. Dana Porter and to all of those who have been active in the operation of this Club during the past year. It has been a year of marked success, particularly, I think, with respect to the speakers. The men and women who have addressed the Club have been outstanding in their own field of endeavour and from the work done by Mr. Porter and all who aided him in bringing this group of speakers, I think we owe a deep vote of thanks.

I have had an opportunity to look over the list of officers and members of the Executive Committee for the ensuing year and I think you have got a strong body. I believe, with their assistance, we can successfully carry on the tradition of this Club during the forthcoming year. If we are as successful as to be comparable with the work accomplished under Mr. Porter and his group of assistants, I would feel entirely satisfied and highly pleased.

Once again, let me thank you for your confidence in electing me to this office and assure you I will do everything in my power to make the forthcoming year successful. (Applause.)

MR. STAPELLS: If I may have the privilege of making a motion—I am implementing what you have already said respecting the Honorary Secretary. It seems to me most fitting to come from me, that a motion should be passed, and it is only the man working from the inside who can appreciate the work of the Honorary Secretary—I think it should be recognized by the body of this meeting as a whole. I would like to move, therefore, that this Club express its sincere thanks to the Honorary Secretary for his work, voluntarily given during the past year.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Brooks. (Received with applause.)

The Annual Meeting was then declared adjourned.

THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Receipts and Payments for the period from 1st January, 1934 to 30th April, 1935.

RECEIPTS

Cash at beginning of Period	$ 4.17	
Fees Received	6,701.25	
Interest on Bank Account	21.14	
Proceeds from sale of Pamphlets and Year Books	92.45	
Sale of Luncheon Tickets	407.00	
TOTAL RECEIPTS		$7,226.01

PAYMENTS

Payment of Bank Overdraft as at 31st December, 1933		$ 319.14	
Repayment of Bank Loan in full		100.00	
Salary—final payment to former Secretary		300.00	
General Expenses:			
Postage, Printing and Stationery	$3,311.80		
Telegrams and Telephone	346.00		
Fees and Expenses of Speakers	841.79		
Recording and Publicity	421.00		
Luncheon Expenses	605.89		
Reconciling and Revising Membership Roll and Accounts and Installing Accounting System	150.00		
Miscellaneous Expenses	86.80	5,763.28	
TOTAL PAYMENTS			$6,482.42
Balance, Cash on Hand and in Bank as at 30th April, 1935			$ 743.59

We have audited the books and accounts of the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, Ontario for the period from 1st January, 1934 to 30th April, 1935, and certify that the foregoing statement of Receipts and Payments is correct according to the best of our information and the explanations given to us and as shown by the books of the Club for the period ended 30th April, 1935.

H. T. JAMIESON & COMPANY,
Chartered Accountants
Auditors.

Toronto, Ontario
20th June, 1935.

HONORARY PRESIDENTS OF THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA, 1903-1935

1903-1912.	Rt. Hon. Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, G.C.M.G., LL.D., D.C.L.*
1913-1926.	Field Marshal H.R.H. The Duke of Connaught and Strathearn, K.G., G.C.M.G.
1927-1931.	Rt. Hon. Viscount Willingdon, G.C.S.I., G.C.M.G.
1931-1935.	Rt. Hon. The Earl of Bessborough, P.G., G.C.M.G.

PAST PRESIDENTS:

1902-04.	Brig.-Gen. James Mason.*
1904-05.	
1905-06.	Rev. William Clark, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L.*
1906-07.	Mr. J. P. Murray.*
1907-08.	Mr. J. F. M. Stewart, B.A.
1908-09.	Dr. D. J. Goggin, M.A., D.C.L.
1909-10.	Dr. Elias Clouse, M.D.
1910-11.	Mr. J. Castell Hopkins, F.S.S.*
1911-12.	Mr. F. B. Fetherstonhaugh, K.C.
1912-13.	Right Reverend James F. Sweeney, M.A., D.D., D.C.L.
1913-14.	Mr. Justice James Craig.*
1914-15.	Lieut.-Colonel R. J. Stuart.
1915-16.	Dr. Albert Ham, Mus. Doc.
1916-17.	Mr. James Black Perry.
1917-18.	Mr. Norman Sommerville, M.A., K.C.
1918.	Mr. F. J. Coombs.
1919.	Mr. R. A. Stapells.
1920.	Mr. Arthur Hewitt.
1921.	Brig.-General C. H. Mitchell, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., LL.D.
1922.	Sir William Hearst, K.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.
1923.	Mr. Ellis H. Wilkinson.
1924.	Mr. William Brooks.
1925.	Rev. Dr. R. N. Burns.
1926.	Col. A. E. Kirkpatrick, Hon., A.D.C.
1927.	Col. Alexander Fraser, LL.D., A.D.C.
1928.	Mr. Robert Fennell.
1929.	Mr. Hugh Eayrs.
1930.	Mr. John D. Spence, K.C.
1931.	Mr. H. G. Stapells.
1932.	Lieut.-Col. Geo. A. Drew.
1933-34.	Major W. Jas. Baxter, M.C.

*Deceased.

CONSTITUTION

INSTITUTED 1903

THE OBJECT OF THE CLUB IS THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE INTERESTS OF CANADA AND A UNITED EMPIRE

Organization of the Club and Branches

Art. 1.—(1) The organization shall be called the Empire Club of Canada.

(2) Branches of the Club may be established with the authority of the Executive Committee, and subject to such conditions and regulations as may from time to time be decided upon by the Club in Toronto.

(3) A committee may be appointed under the provisions of sub-section 2, article 1 for the establishment of branches of the Club, and the word "Unit" shall denote a Branch.

Classes of Members

Art. 2.—The Membership of the Club shall consist of

(a) Active Resident Members,
(b) Non-Resident Members,
(c) Life Members,
(d) Honorary Members.
(e) Associate Members,

All members must be of the full age of sixteen years, and members of classes a, b, c and d must be British subjects.

Active Resident, Non-Resident and Associate Members

Art. 3.—(1) Candidates for Active Resident, Non-Resident and Associate Membership shall be proposed and seconded by two members of the Club in good standing, and shall be elected by a two-third majority of those present at any meeting of the Executive Committee.

(2) Subject to subsection 4 of this article active resident and associate members shall pay an annual fee of $4.00 and non-resident members $3.00, payable on the first day of October in each year in respect of the Club year from May 1 to April 30 then current. Payment of such fees shall entitle each member to receive a copy of

the Year Book. No member in arrears for fees or dues shall be considered in good standing or be eligible for office.

(3) Associate members shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

(4) Members whose applications for membership are received after the first day of April in any year shall pay one annual fee only in respect of the period from that time till the 30th day of April in the following calendar year.

(5) In the year 1934-1935 active resident and associate members who have paid their fees to December 31st, 1934, shall be allowed a credit of $1.00 upon their fees for the year ending April 30, 1935. Non-resident members shall be allowed a credit of 75c.

Life Members

Art. 4.—(1) Life Members, not exceeding ten in any one year, may be elected from time to time, at an open meeting of the Club, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee. Provided, however, that Ministers of the Federal Parliament and Premiers of the different Provinces of the Dominion of Canada may be eligible for election at any time, even though their election may cause the number of Life Members to exceed ten in one year.

(2) Life Members shall pay a fee of $50.00 in one sum.

Art. 5.—(1) Honorary Members may be elected upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, and at a general meeting of the Club.

(2) Honorary Members shall be exempt from the payment of fees, but shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

Officers to be Elected

Art. 6.—(1) The officers of the Club shall consist of an Honorary President; a President; First, Second and

Third Vice-Presidents; a Treasurer, a Secretary, or a Secretary-Treasurer; the Executive Committee shall consist of these officers an 17 other members who with the officers shall be elected by ballot, and of the ex-officio members hereinafter mentioned. All Past Presidents shall constitute an Advisory Council under the Chairmanship of the immediate Past President and such Advisory Council shall elect annually three members, who, together with the retiring President, shall be the ex-officio members of the Executive Committee for the ensuing year.

Election of Officers

(2) The Election of Officers of the Club shall take place at a general meeting of the members, to be held not later than April 15 of each year, at a date to be decided upon by the Executive Committee, and this meeting shall be deemed to be the Annual Meeting. And the officers and Executive Committee then elected shall hold office till April 30, of the following year, and thereafter until their successors respectively have been duly elected and installed. A committee to nominate the officers for the new year shall be appointed at a regular or special meeting to be held not less than four, and not more than six weeks before such Annual Meeting, due notice of such meeting to be given to all members in good standing, and such committee shall report to the Annual Meeting; provided that no member shall be nominated to any office unless and until he has given notice in writing that he consents to such nomination and will act if elected to the position for which he has been nominated.

(3) Two Auditors shall be elected at each Annual Meeting.

Standing Committees

(4) Standing Committees shall be appointed as follows:—

(*a*) Finance Committee.
(*b*) Speakers' Committee.

(*c*) Membership Committee.
(*d*) Constitution Committee.
(*e*) Luncheon and Reception Committee.
(*f*) Publicity Committee.
(*g*) Royal Colonial Institute Committee.

Filling of Vacancies Among Officers

Art. 7.—In the event of an office becoming vacant by death, resignation, or otherwise, the vacancy thus caused shall be filled by the Executive Committee and the person so chosen shall hold office until the next Annual Meeting.

Duties of Officers

Art. 8.—The duties of the officers shall be those customary to such positions in similar organizations.

Holding of Meetings

Art. 9.—(1) The Club shall hold general meetings weekly from October to May, both inclusive, in each twelve months with such intermissions as from time to time may be decided upon.

(2) At the Annual Meeting a report of the year's proceedings and work shall be submitted by the President, and this report shall be accompanied by an interim report from the Treasurer. The Treasurer shall, in addition to the interim report presented at the Annual Meeting, present an audited statement of the finances of the Club for the full financial year at a regular meeting of the Club held during the month of May.

Notice of Meetings

Art. 10.—Written or printed notices of all meetings shall be given to the members of the Club. Such notices shall be sufficient if addressed to the members, and deposited post paid in the post office in Toronto.

Quorum at Meetings

Art. 11.—Fifteen members in good standing shall constitute a quorum at any meeting of the Club, general, annual or special and the presiding officer shall have a casting vote. Six members shall form a quorum of the Executive Committee.

Limitation of Business at General Meetings

Art. 12.—No business other than the hearing of the addresses and notices of motion shall be introduced at any meeting of the Club, unless it has been submitted to the Executive Committee and received its aproval.

Calling of Special Meetings

Art. 13.—Meetings of the Executive Committee shall be called by the President, or on a requisition signed by three of its members. Special meetings of the Club may be called by the President, and shall be called by him on a requisition signed by twelve members and stating the object of the meeting. This object shall be stated in the notice calling the special meeting.

Financial Year

Art. 14.—The Financial Year of the Club shall begin on the first day of May in each year and end on the thirtieth day of April in the year following.

Amendments to Constitution

Art. 15.—This Constitution may be amended at the Annual Meeting, or at a special meeting called for that purpose, subject to a two-thirds majority vote of the members present.

LIFE AND HONORARY MEMBERS

Borden, Sir R. L.
Bruce, Hon. Dr. Herbert A.

Clouse, Dr. Elias
Coombs, F. J.
Crowther, W. C.

Fetherstonhaugh, F.B., K.C.
Fraser, Col. Alexander

Gibbons, John J.
Goggin, Dr. D. J.

Ham, Dr. Albert
Hewitt, Arthur

Kernahan, W. T.

MacDougall, A. Roy
MacKay, John
MacKendrick, Col. W. G.
McWhinney, W. J., K.C.

Pellatt, Sir H. W.
Perry, J. B.

Scythes, J. A.
Stapells, H. G.
Stapells, R. A.
Stewart, J. F. M.
Stuart, Lt. Col. R. J.
Sweeney, Most Rev. Bishop

Tindall, H. B.

Wood, E. R.

RESIDENT MEMBERS

Abbs, Chas. E.
Adams, A. A.
Adams, G. W.
Adamson, G. A.
Agar, Norman E.
Aird, Sir John
Aird, W. H.
Aitchison, J. F.
Alley, B. P.
Allen, Dr. David W.
Allen, Geo. H.
Allin, R. W.
Ambrose, J. R. W.
Amos, A. A.
Anderson, Dr. H. B.
Andison, T. H.
Anglin, Sydney E.
Appleton, C. N.
Archdekin, W. O.
Archibald, Dr. T. D.
Armour, Rev. J. B. M.
Armstrong, J. S. P.
Armstrong, W. J.
Arnott, John P.
Ashlin, C. H. N.
Ashton, T. L.
Atkinson, Fred.
Atkinson, L. R.
Austin, R. H.

Bainard, R. H.
Baird, J. M.
Baker, Geo. A.
Baldwin, H. A.
Baldwin, L. H.
Balfour, Major G.B., K.C.
Barber, Geo.
Barlow, F. H., K.C.
Barnard, A. W.
Bastedo, Norman H.
Batten, W. Howard
Battely, E. R.
Baxter, Major W. James
Baynes-Reed, Rev. Canon W.L.
Beairsto, A. H. C.
Beal, A. H.
Bealey, E. R.
Beardmore, Lt. Col. Torrance

Beatty, C. G.
Beatty, E. P.
Beatty, Dr. Hy. A.
Becker, Dr. C. W.
Begg, Herbert
Belden, Dr. G. F.
Bell, H. Brooke
Bell, T. H.
Bennet, J. A.
Bennett, E. J.
Berkeley, H. C.
Best, A. F.
Bethel, Frank
Biggar, Dr. J. L.
Billings, J. W.
Binns, P. W.
Bird, E. S.
Bishop, Col. A. L.
Bishop, G.
Bishop, H. H.
Biton, Walter R.
Blackburn, D. D.
Blackburn, F. J.
Blachford, F. A.
Blackstock, Col. G. G.
Blackwell, B. S.
Bodington, M. B.
Bogert, C. A.
Bongard, Gordon R.
Bongard, R. R.
Bonnell, W. H. M.
Bourlier, H. C.
Boyce, J. F.
Boyd, Mossom De G.
Brace, G. A.
Brace, J. H.
Bradshaw, Thomas
Brant, W. A.
Brathwait,e, F. Y. W.
Bredin, M.
Breithaupt, W W.
Brigden, Geo.
Brittain, Horace L.
Brooks, W.
Broughall, Rev. Canon J. S.
Brown, A. T.
Brown, Edgar P.
Brown, F. D.
Brown, F. H.
Brown, F. I.
Brown, Henry
Brown, W. E.
Browne, James
Bryce, Robt. A.
Bryson, R. N.
Burgess, C. H.
Burgess, Harold E.
Burns, H. D.
Burns, Rev. Dr. R. N.
Burton, C. L.
Burton, E. G.

Cairns, W. J.
Calvert, A. Morrison
Cameron, J. Duncan
Cameron, John D.
Cameron, M. C.
Cameron, W. A.
Campbell, Dr. Colin A.
Campbell, G. C.
Cardy, R. H.
Carleton, Ed. M.
Carlisle, C. H.
Carr-Harris, Major R. R.
Carradus, Capt. H. R.
Carrie, Nichol
Carruthers, Geo.
Carter, F. C.
Carter, J. Smyth
Carthy, Dr. W. C.
Cartwright, Brig. Gen. G. S.
Caulder, J. A.
Caven, Dr. W. R.
Chalmers, Floyd S.
Chandler, Harry S.
Chapeau, Arthur C.
Charles, Leo. E.
Chave, B. W.
Cherry, P. G.
Chipman, J. H.
Chisholm, Lt. Col. Geo. T.
Christie, W. B.
Clapperton, H. G.
Clark, C. T.
Clark, Dr. Harold
Clark, Herbert A., K.C.

Clark, Dr. Wm. J.
Clarkson, R.
Clendenan, Dr. G. W.
Cliff, Geo. J.
Close, T. B.
Clouse, F. L.
Cody, Rev. Canon H. J.
Cohen, J. L.
Coke, Major E. F.
Colebrook, H. G.
Colquhoun, C. M.
Colthurst, H. Neville
Colwell, C. A. Edward
Cooper, Chas. K.
Cooper, R. J.
Corlett, W. E.
Corson, R. R.
Corcoran, J. E.
Cosford, T. A.
Cosgrave, Provost F. H.
Coste, E. F.
Cotter, Harold L.
Coulter, J. E.
Coulter, W. C.
Cowan, Clarke L.
Cowan, Major R. Cecil
Craick, W. A.
Craig, T. A.
Crang, J. H.
Crighton, A. S.
Crockett, E.
Crombie, Keith B.
Crossland, E. F.
Crowell, Samuel G.
Crysler, Alfred Cosby
Cuthbertson, L. E.
Cutten, L. F.
Cuttle, A. H.

Daly, R. A.
Daly, Roland O.
Dalziel, Col. Wm. R.
Davies, M. L.
Davis, Bruce P.
Davis, Geo. D.
Davis, R. Reade
Davis, W. H.
Day, Major Bernhard
Deacon, Col. F. H.
Dean, Rev. S. W.
Dean, T. Norman
Dean, W. G.
Defoe, C. W.
DeGuerre, H. W.
Dempsey, H. D.
Denne, A. J.
Denton, Frank
DeVries, Henry M.
DeWitt, H. N.
DeWitt, N. W.
Dickinson, Capt. Chas. E.
Dickinson, Major F. R.
Dickson, Rev. Dr. Geo. A.
Dilworth, F. J.
Dilworth, W. A.
Dingle, Gordon R. M.
Dingman, H. J.
Dixon, Rev. Canon John H.
Doan, A. K.
Doherty, Hon. Manning W.
Donaldson, G. R.
Douglas, J. S.
Douglas, Howard R.
Drayton, Sir Henry
Drew, Lt. Col. Geo. A.
Drew, John
Drummond, H. A.
Duffett, Norman G.
Duggan, R. B.
Duncan, E. J. B.
Duncan, S. F.
Duncan, Stanley
Dunkelman, D.
Dunstan, Kenneth J.
Dyke, Jas. E.

Eastmure, A. W.
Eaton, R. Y.
Eayrs, Hugh S.
Eby, H. D.
Edge, Alfred
Edge, H. P.
Edmonds, Geo.
Edwards, A. Geoffrey
Edwards, H. Percy
Edwards, Oswald N.

Elgie, G. C.
Elliott, L.
Ellis, J. F.
Ellis, M. L.
Ellis, Matthew T.
Ellsworth, A. L.
Elton, J. O.
Ely, E. F.
English Thos. H.
Evans, Arthur C.

Fair, W. W.
Fairhead, Newman
Fairweather, R. H.
Falconer, H. W.
Falconer, Sir Robt.
Fallis, Col. Geo. O.
Fanning, John
Fennell, Robt. H.
Ferguson, B. H.
Ferguson, H. M.
Ferguson, John
Ferguson, J. F.
Ferguson, M.
Fetherstonhaugh, J. E. M.
Fidler, Rev. A. J.
Fisher, A. B.
Fisher, J. W.
Fishman, P.
Fitch, P. F.
Fitzgerald, D. G.
Flavelle, Sir Joseph
Fleming, Atwell Jr.
Fleming, Donald M.
Fleming, G. O.
Flynn, J.
Forrester, David
Forrester, Wm. J.
Forster, J. W. L.
Fortner, C. H.
Fowler, Paul S.
Fox, W. Claude
Frame, S. J.
Francis, Arthur J.
Francis, G. C.
Frankel, Roy H.
Freyseng, Edward J.
Frost, Harold R.
Fry, H.

Gale, Geo. C.
Gale, R. H.
Gamble, W. J.
Ganong, J. E., Jr.
Garden, A. M.
Garrett, H. H.
Geary, B. Handley
Genovese, Frank
Gianelli, Chevalier V.
Gibbons, Alan O.
Gibson, D. H.
Gibson, J. A.
Gibson, J. G.
Gibson, Wm. Robt.
Gilchrist, Prof. Lachlan
Giles, T. S. H.
Gilmour, A. H.
Gillespie, James
Goff, John B.
Goldberg, A. M. P.
Gooderham, A. E., Jr.
Gooderham, Sir Albert
Gooderham, E. D.
Gooderham, Geo. H.
Gooding, T. W.
Goodman, Theo.
Gordon, A. B.
Gordon, T. A.
Gordon W. Lockhart
Gordon, Wm. E.
Gowdy, D. M.
Grant, D. E.
Grant, Gordon
Grasett, S.
Gray, F. M.
Greene, A. R.
Gresham, G. E.
Grier, A. Monro
Griffiths, F. D.
Griffin, R. H.
Grills, T. O.
Guest, A. E.
Guilfoyle, H. E.
Gullen, Dr. J. B.
Gundy, J. H.
Gundy, S. B.
Gunn, Edmond
Gunn, Brig. Gen. John A.

Hair, Dr. C. H
Hales, James
Hall, Albert C.
Hall, F. M.
Hall, I. C.
Ham, C. N.
Hambly, Geo.
Hamilton, A. E.
Hamilton, C. S.
Hamilton, Grey, K.C.
Hamilton, H. K.
Hamilton, R. S.
Hammell, J. E.
Hampson, Edmund E.
Hanna, J. B.
Harcourt, R. M.
Hardy, H. R.
Hargraft, Geo. N.
Hargraft, L. G.
Hargraft, W. M.
Hargreaves, Roy
Harris, W. M.
Harkness, A. H.
Harler, F. C.
Harling, R. Dawson
Harpham, Horace
Harvey, D. W.
Harvey, E. J.
Harvey, Dr. W. J.
Hastings, C. E.
Hatch, A. E.
Hawke, Eugene
Hawkins, Dr. Chas. S.
Hawthorne, J. D., Jr.
Hay, Frank
Hay, Ruthven
Hearst, Sir Wm.
Heaven, W. J.
Hector, R. H. B.
Heintzman, Charles T.
Heintzman, G. B.
Heintzman, Geo. C.
Henderson, Robert
Hendrie, Geo. C.
Henry, Edward B.
Henry, Hon. G. S.
Henwood, H. B.
Herbinson, Wm.
Herington, Gordon
Hermant, Percy
Hern, Rev. Gordon
Herod, Wesley J.
Hethrington, Major E. A.
Hewitt, Wm. W.
Hewitt, Gordon W.
Hewson, E. G.
Higgins, Fred Page
Hill, F. W. J.
Hill, Roy C.
Hobberlin, A. M.
Hobbs, Geo.
Hobkirk, John F.
Hodgeman, M. S.
Hoidge, W. H.
Holliss, J. F.
Holmested, G. S.
Honan, James
Hooper, Lt. Col. B. O.
Hopkins, Percy E.
Horwood, J. C. B.
Houghton, E. O.
Houston, H. C.
Howard, Clifford H.
Howe, H. J.
Howes, Joseph E.
Howse, Thos. H.
Huckvale, Robert
Hudson, T. C.
Hughes, Major Gen. G.B.
Hughes, Gordon R.
Hughes, S. A.
Hugill, W. M.
Humphrey, Dr. John N.
Humphries, G. W.
Hunter, B. B.
Hunter, Lt. Col. F. Fraser
Hunter, H. T.
Huston, E. T.
Huston, J. A.
Hutchinson, Morton C.
Hutchison, O. A.

Inglis, Wm.
Irving, T. T.

Jackman, H. R.
Jackson, Dr. G. F

Jackson, Prof. G. E.
Jackson, Thomas D.
Jacob, E. R.
Jaffray, W. G.
Jamieson, H. T.
Jamieson, K. W.
Jaquith, Dr. L. E.
Jarvis, G. Arthur
Jarvis, H. C.
Jarvis, H. St. J.
Jarvis, Norman S.
Jefferis, C. A.
Jennings, P. H.
Jephcott, Gerald
Johnson, C. E.
Johnson, D. O.
Johnson, Main
Johnston, Col. Baptist
Johnston, Erskine B.
Johnston, R. B.
Johnston, Dr. Samuel
Johnston, W. R.
Jones, G. J. L.
Jones, J. Erle
Jones, Sydney H.
Jones, T. Roy
Junkin, Major Lawrence

Kee, H. A.
Kellam, Geo. M.
Kennedy, J. DeN.
Kent, Palmer
Kerr, Rev. J. McD.
Kerr, John E.
Keys, Prof. D. R.
Kidd, Hon. T. Ashmore
Kilbourn, K. M.
Kilgour, R. C.
Kingsland, W. A.
Kingsmill, Col. W. B.
Kinsman, J. Victor
Kirkpatrick, Col. A. E.
Kirkpatrick, A. M. M.
Kirkpatrick, W. R.
Kirschmann, A. N.
Knight, Cyril W.
Knight, Norman
Knowlton, Thos. E.

Laidlaw, John B.
LaBine, Chas.
Lamb, John R.
Lamont, W. H.
Landell, C. D.
Lang, Jas.
Langmuir, A. W.
Langton, Brig. Gen. J. G.
Larrington, Arthur
Lascelles, G. A.
Laughton, H. V.
Laut, Wallace J.
Lavine, Arthur
Lea, Herbert
Ledger, W. R.
Lee, H. T. I.
Lee, Lawlor
Leibel, Wm.
Lemon, W. E.
Leonard, T. D'Arcy
Leslie, Robt. R.
LeSueur, R. V.
Lindsay, W. W.
Linnell, A. P.
Linton, Hall
Lister, M. Parker
Little, Wm.
Livesay, J. F.
Locke, Clarke
Locke, Dr. Geo. H.
Lount, H. M.
Love, M. A.
Lovering, Egerton
Loveys, Geo. C.
Lucas, F. O.
Lucas, I. B.
Lyon, L. S.

Macabe, Thos. J.
MacAlpine, Col. C. D. H.
Macaulay, Hon. Leopold
MacBeth, John C.
MacBrien, W. A. H.
MacDonald, Dr. A. E.
Macdonald, Hugh
MacFadyen, W. T. A.
MacFarlane, E. S.
Macgregor, Jas. Patrick

MacGillivray, G. A.
MacKay, Col. J. Keiller
MacKenzie, D. R.
MacKinnon, J. Bruce
MacLaren, J. F.
MacLaren, Ian
MacLean, Hugh C.
MacLean, Col. J. B.
MacLeod, J. K.
MacMillan, Dr. R. J.
Macnamara, W. R.
MacQuarrie, Donald R.
Macrae, A. Montye
Macrae, E. M.
Madill, Rev. A. S.
Magi, M. I.
Malcolm, C. S.
Mallison, Fred.
Mancantelli, Robt.
Manley, Jas. P.
Manning, T. R.
Marsh, F. Hedley
Marshall, K. R.
Martin, E. C.
Martin, J. H.
Masse, O.
Massey, A. L.
Matthews, A. B.
Matthews, Arnold C.
Matthews, W. Donald
Matthews, F. B.
Matthews, James G.
Maunsell, J. Q.
Maxwell, John
May, Geo. E.
Maybee, J. Edward
McAdam, S.
McAll, H. W.
McBain, Alex.
McBride, James
McCarthy, Leighton
McClain, John W.
McCleary, Rev. Ray
McClelland, D. McK.
McCloskey, H. C.
McConnell, Dr. J. H.
McCoubrey, J. W.
McCoy, D. B.
McCoy, G. E.
McCraw, D. F.
McCrea, Hon. Chas.
McCrea, John M.
McCrea, T. Arthur
McCrimmon, D. A.
McCulley, Jos.
McCullough, J. W.
McDonagh, Dr. A. J.
McDonell, T. E.
McDougall, D. L.
McEachran, Wm. T.
McElheran, Rev. Dr. R. B.
McEwen, G. C.
McGarry, Hon. T. W.
McGaw, T. D.
McGee, Col. H.
McGillivray, M. W.
McGillivray, T. A.
McIntosh, A. N.
McIntosh, Thomas W.
McIntyre, K.
McKee, H. T.
McKeown, S. W.
McKerrow, J. M.
McKerrow, J. O.
McKinley, Dr. J. N.
McKinnon, Neil J.
McKinnon, W. L.
McKnight, M.
McLeod, D. I.
McLeod, Geo. J.
McLeod, J. A.
McLeod, W. N.
McMahon, F.
McMillan, Norman
McMillan, John B.
McMullen, Robt.
McMurray, Leonard L.
McMurrich, G. Don
McMurtry, R. R.
McNair, C.
McNeill, E. W.
McNeillie, Geo. G.
McPherson, Geo. E.
McPherson, R. S.
McTavish, D. D.
McWhinney, J. M.

McWilliams, C. E. P.
McWilliams, D. B.
McWilliams, M. H.
Medland, John
Meldrum, G. H.
Mellish, A. E.
Menhenitt, E. H.
Merchant, Dr. F. W.
Meredith, C. H.
Merrick, D. A. Y.
Merry, Martin N.
Mess, Lt. Col. James
Middleton, A. N.
Miles, Arthur W.
Millar, W. E.
Miller, Andrew
Miller, P. C.
Mills, C. A.
Mills, S. S.
Mitchell, A. N.
Mitchell, Brig. Gen. C. H.
Mitchell, B. L.
Mitchell, C. S. F.
Mitchell, J. W.
Mitchell, L. W.
Mitchell, W. G.
Mitchell, Lt. Col. W. G.
Moffat, W. R.
Mole, H. S.
Montgomery, A. H.
Montgomery, Jos.
Monypenny, T. F.
Moore, C. R.
Moore, F.
Moore, H. Napier
Moore, R. C.
More, W. G.
Morley, R. B.
Morris, Alex. C.
Morris, C. J.
Morris, E. M.
Morris, James
Morris, R. S.
Morrow, Ellis H.
Morrow, F. K.
Morrow, Graham
Morrow, G. A.
Mothersill, W. R.
Moysey, Arthur E.
Mulholland, Fred. A.
Mulqueen, F. J.
Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.
Mulock, Wm. P.
Munnoch, Gordon R.
Muntz, G. H.
Murphy, Edward J.
Murphy, Jos.
Murphy, J. A.
Murray, Rev. J. Lovell
Murray, Joseph
Muskett, H. W.
Musson, C. J.
Mutch, C. M.

Nash, Major A. E.
Nash, Gerald
Naylor, W. S.
Neale, B. A.
Needham, C. F.
Needham, R. J.
Neelands, C. F.
Neelands, E. V.
Neilly, Balmer
Newman, Hy. A.
Newton, B. G.
Nicholson, C. H.
Nicholson, H. A.
Nicholson, Jas.
Nimmo, Bruce D.
Nixon, W. W.
Noble, Wilfred G.
Northey, R. K.
Northey, R. V.
Norton, T. W. F.

O'Brian, Geoffrey S.
O'Brian, R. B.
O'Brien, G. E.
Ogilvy, Chas.
Olver, E. A.
O'Neill, H. T.
Osborne, Col. J. Ewart
Osler, F. G.
Ostrom, W. R.

Packham, J. M.
Page, Wm. A.

Pakes, S. A.
Palmer, A. W.
Palter, E.
Parker, Dr. Chas. B.
Parker, Robt.
Parkinson, M.
Parkinson, N. F.
Parmenter, R. H.
Patrick, W. G.
Patten, Henry C.
Patterson, C. S.
Patterson, H. F.
Patterson, J. P.
Patteson, J. C.
Payne, Jas.
Pearce, R. John
Pearson, J. A.
Pearson, John
Peckover, Cecil R.
Pember, W. T.
Pepall, Geo. T.
Perry, Geo. D.
Perry, H. M.
Perry, Lt. Col. Norman D.
Petman, Robt.
Pettipiere, R.
Pettit, Godfrey S.
Phillips, Nathan
Phillips, William
Philp, Dr. Geo. R.
Philpott, W. M.
Phipps, A. E.
Picking, Lt. Col. F. J.
Pike, Theodore
Plant, W. H.
Playter, W. P.
Porter, D. H.
Porter, Dr. Geo. D.
Potter, Chas. Ed.
Powell, H. F.
Powley, J.
Pratt, J.P., K.C.
Prentice, Victor F.
Price, Lt. Col. W. H.
Pringle, J. F.
Proctor, A. H. C.
Pugh, Harold
Pullan, Harry
Rabjohn, R. H.
Rae, Robt.
Raney, Fraser
Rathbun, L. M.
Reaves, Campbell
Reburn, E. T.
Reburn, H.
Reed, Col. LeGrand
Reid, A. M.
Reid, Fraser D.
Reid, Loftus H.
Renfrew, Allen E.
Rennie, Thomas
Reynolds, Lt. Col. Chas. E.
Richardson, G. G.
Richardson, Robt. D.
Riddle, W. C.
Ringland, H. S.
Roberts, Major A. Kelso
Roberts, C. Percy
Roberts, F. E.
Roberts, H. K.
Robertson, A. E.
Robertson, C. S.
Robertson, Lt. Col. D. M.
Robertson, Douglas S.
Roberston, Duncan
Robertson, N. S.
Robertson, R. A.
Robertson, W. E.
Roberston, W. G.
Robins, Lt. Col. F. B.
Robinson, J. Beverley
Robinson, T. Stanley
Rogers, G. H.
Rogerson, J. G.
Rollason, W. E.
Rolph, F. A., Sr.
Rose, F. W.
Ross, Bruce D.
Rotenburg, Harry
Routley, Lt.-Col. F. S.
Rowell, Hon. N. W., K.C.
Rowland, Henry A.
Rowland, W. Alex.
Rowley, Col. C. W.
Ruddy, E. L.

Rumsey, W. F.
Russell, T. A.

Sachs, Rabbi Samuel
St. Lawrence, F.
Salter, W. R.
Sandham, E. A.
Sandwell, B. K.
Sauer, Emil
Saunders, E. M.
Sawers, Rev. Canon F. J.
Scales, C. H.
Scandrett, J. H.
Scarth, Col. W. H.
Scheuer, Edmund
Schiff, Emile
Schurman, C. D.
Scott, S. C.
Scott, W. S.
Scroggie, Geo. E.
Seagram, J. W.
Seitz, Ernest
Seitz, J. J.
Selby, Reginald
Selby, W. T. H.
Sewell, W. S.
Sexsmith, J. Alex.
Shannon, Frank
Shapley, W. H.
Sharp, S. J.
Shaver, Gordon N., K.C.
Shearer, R. W. R.
Sherring, J. B.
Shields, C. B.
Shier, Dr. R. V. B.
Sifton, Major Clifford
Sime, A. Watson
Simpson, J. R.
Simpson, Jas. I.
Sinclair, A. W. R.
Sinclair, D. B.
Sinclair, Neil
Smallpiece, V. N.
Smith, A. L.
Smith, C. P.
Smith, F. D. L.
Smith, G. Everton
Smith, G. H.
Smith, H. M.
Smith, Paul L.
Smith, Victor A.
Smith, W. Earl
Smoke, A. L.
Snider, C. H. J.
Sommerville, Norman
Sommerville, Wm. E.
Soper, D. N.
Southall, H. L.
Sparrow, J. M.
Speedie, Geo.
Spence, John D., K.C.
Squire, S. L.
Stanford, F. T.
Stanley, J. N.
Stanley, Richard T.
Statten, Taylor
Stephenson, Dr. F. C.
Stephenson, H. R.
Stewart, A. G.
Stewart, Alan E.
Stewart, D.
Stewart, D. K.
Stewart, John W. W.
Stewart, R. T.
Stewart, W. Dunlop
Stewart, Wm. J.
Stillwell, Rev. Dr. H. E.
Stoddart, W. H.
Strachan, James
Strathy, Jas. G. K.
Strickland, V. D.
Stupart, Sir Fred
Sutton, W. E.
Syrett, Chas. V.

Tarbox, Hugh B.
Taylor, E. Geo. T.
Taylor, E. P.
Taylor, J. G.
Taylor, Jos.
Taylor, W. D.
Teakle, R. B.
Thom, Kenneth
Thompson, E. F.
Thompson, Geo. W.
Thompson, Gordon V.

Thompson, J. W.
Thompson, Norman L.
Thomson, H. G.
Thomson, J. B.
Thomson, W. R.
Tidy, Major Frank O.
Tisdall, Chas. P.
Tolchard, F. D.
Topping, Victor
Torrance, R. D.
Tory, John A.
Tovell, Dr. H. M.
Toye, Eldred D.
Tozer, Henry S.
Trano, O. M.
Trent, E. W.
Tucker, Edward J.
Tugwell, H. C.
Turner, E. H.
Turner, H. R.
Turner, James
Turvey, Wm. T.
Tuteur, M. P.
Twiss, B. A.
Tyrell, H. V.
Tyrell, Wm.
Tyrrell, E. C.
Tyrrell, Garrett

Vale, John M.
Van Blaricom, G. B.
Van Koughnet, Arthur
Van Lane, F. A.
Van Lane, J. F.
Varty, W. Geo.
Vaughan, J. J.
Venables, Francis G.
Verral, Geo. W.
Von Maur, Jacob D.

Wadsworth, R. B.
Wagstaff, Fred
Waldie, R. S.
Walker, B. G.
Walker, Charles
Walker, C. H.
Walker, D. J.
Walker, E. B.
Walker, H. C.
Wallace, H. LeRoy
Wallace, Princ. Malcolm W.
Walmsley, Joseph
Walsh, Fred T.
Walsh, J. E.
Walsh, J. J.
Walton, W. R., Jr.
Ward, Rev. James E.
Wardlaw, T. D.
Ward-Whate, Rev. F. C.
Warren, Dr. C. A.
Warren, F. A.
Warren, Harold D.
Warwick, Geo. R.
Warwick, R. D.
Waters, H. W.
Watson, H. E. G.
Watson, G. F.
Watson, J. Graeme
Watson, J. P.
Watson, T. H.
Watson, W. B.
Watson, W. G.
Watson, Col. W. H.
Watson, Dr. W. V.
Watt, J. L.
Way, W. B.
Webster, A. Guy
Webster, Howard
Welch, Frank
Werlich, Angus A.
Westman, A. E. R.
Weston, J. F.
Westren, J.
Wetherell, J. E.
Wheatley, E.
White, Frank W.
White, H. A.
White, Sir Thomas
Whitehead, J. H.
Whiteley, J.
Whittingham, Major H.
Wildblood, Geo. W.
Wilkes, F. Hilton
Wilkinson, E. H.
Williams, A. W.
Williams, H. H.

Williams, Robt. J.
Williams, R. J.
Willinsky, Dr. A. I.
Willoughby, J. A.
Wills, Harold A.
Wilson, C. Lesslie
Wilson, G. D.
Wilson, Geo.
Wilson, Ian R. F.
Wilson, J. R.
Wilson, John
Wilson, M. Franklin
Wilson, Col. R. S.
Winter, L. A.
Wishart, Dr. D. E. S.
Wolfenden, Hugh H.
Wood, F. P.
Wood, L. M.
Woodcock, Rev. Canon H. F. D.
Woods, Damon C.
Wright, E. F.
Wright, L. V.
Wyse, J. F. H.

Young, Prof. A. H.
Young, Frank,
Young, John A.
Young, J. B.

NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS

Baker, Robert P.
Beaumont, Jos.
Bogle, Robt.
Boxer, Reginald N.
Bradley, E.
Brown, Mervyn

Cawthra-Elliott, Maj. Gen. H. M.
Cockeram, Robt.

Grainger, A. H.

Hamilton, W. E.

Matthews, Hon. R. C.
McIntyre, R. L.
McLaughlin, Col. R. S.
McLean, W. A.

Osbourne, Wm. A.
Over, Spencer Henry

Phillips, Col. W. E.
Ponton, Col. W. N.

Raven, Rev. C. C.
Richardson, Dr. R. N. C.

Shergold, Major C.
Sinclair, Dr. D. J.
Smith, A. St. Albans
Somerville, J. N.
Stirling, Wm. T.

Torrance, R. L.

Vincent, J.

Wark, Geo. D.
Whidden, Dr. Howard P.
Wideman, Albert
Wideman, Harvey
Wills, R. Dean